OFFICIAL PLAN REVIEW

PHASE III

CONSULTATION DOCUMENTATION

**SUMMARY OF AND RESPONSE TO
SUBMISSIONS 1 TO 162
(THOSE RECEIVED BY MID-NOVEMBER, 1987)
IN RESPONSE TO THE
DRAFT OFFICIAL PLAN,
MAY 1987**

Regional Municipality of Ottawa-Carleton

November, 1988

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction	i
List of Submissions - in Order Received	iii
Summary of Briefs and Staff Response	1
List of Submissions - in Alphabetical Order by Author	126
List of Submissions - in Order of Submitter Type	130

INTRODUCTION

Staff recommendations for a Draft Regional Official Plan were published in May 1987. Planning Committee held a public meeting on the Draft Official Plan on 15, 16, 17 and 18 September 1987 and completed its main deliberations on the Draft Official Plan in early November 1987. This report summarizes the points made in written briefs and oral presentations at the public meeting and in later briefs received by early November and provides a response to each point.

The briefs are listed in the order they were received by the Planning Department. To aid in the reading of this document the comments made in each brief are regular type, and a staff response follows in italic type. The comments are either a direct quote or a paraphrase of the key points from each brief. It should be noted that for a complete and accurate reading of the content of the briefs, reference should be made to the original brief (copies available for review from the Regional Planning Department, major local lending libraries and the Clerks of the area municipalities).

The main points raised in each brief have been responded to by staff based on the decisions made by Regional Council when it adopted the new Regional Official Plan. Typically, the staff response states how the concern about a proposal in the Draft Official Plan has (or has not) been resolved in the adopted Plan adopted by Regional Council. On occasion a response states that the Regional Official Plan is not the appropriate means to address a particular concern, either because the concern is outside the jurisdiction of an Official Plan (as provided for in the Ontario Planning Act), or because the concern is too detailed for a Regional Plan and can be more correctly addressed in other documents (e.g. local official plans, municipal housing statements).

Coding

On the following pages, the comments and staff responses are coded. In the left-hand margin are numbers separated by periods. The first two digits refer to the Part of the Draft Official Plan to which the comments refers. The next three digits refer to sections and subsections of the Draft Official Plan. The two digits after the space refer to an objective or policy number; the number in brackets refers to a sub-policy (if any). If the comment refers to a particular Schedule of the Official Plan, the letter of the Schedule appears in the space after the policy and sub-policy. The coding spaces are filled with 0's whenever there is not a specific reference. For ease of reference the Parts and Schedules of the Official Plan are listed below.

Parts of the Regional Official Plan

1. Introduction
2. Regional Development Strategy
3. The Urban Area
4. Development in the Rural Area
5. Resource Area Policies
6. Housing
7. Environmental Constraints
8. River Corridors
9. The Visual
10. Environmental Protection
11. Transportation
12. Environment and Heritage Resources

Schedules of the Regional Official Plan

A. Rural Policy Plan
B. Urban Policy Plan
C1. Future Urban Regional Roads Plan
C2. Urban Regional Roads Rights-of-Way Protection Policy Plan
D1. Future Rural Regional Roads Plan
D2. Rural Regional Roads Rights-of-Way Protection Policy Plan
E. Transitway Route
F. Scenic Routes and Major Bicycle Corridors
G. Environmental Constraints
H. Rural Servicing

Set out on the following three pages is a list of the briefs in the order of their appearance in this report (in order received). Two additional lists of the submissions received are included at the end of this report, one in alphabetical order by author and another by category of author (e.g. agency, community association, development interest, etc.) to aid in the location of briefs.

Even though there were 231 submissions, the summary of briefs and staff responses includes only the 162 briefs that were received by early November 1987, when Planning Committee completed its main deliberations on the Draft Official Plan of May 1987. Many of the submissions received after that date were in response to the November 1987 revised draft and to recommendations being made by Planning Committee and reported in the media. All 231 submissions have been published in five volumes and can be obtained by contacting the Planning Department. The submissions summarized here are in volumes A, B, and C; the later submissions are in volumes D and E. The lists, at the end of this report, include references to pages both in the volumes of published briefs and in this summary of briefs and staff response.

LIST OF SUBMISSIONS IN ORDER RECEIVED

No.	Submitter	Page
1	Ontario Ministry of Education	1
2	Minister of Public Works (Canada)	1
3	National Capital Commission	1
4	Ontario Ministry of Transportation and Communications	1
5	Mr. David Makow	1
6	Mrs. Barbara McGee	1
7	Ontario Ministry of Community and Social Services	2
8	City of Kanata	2
9	Mr. M.J. O'Connor	2
10	Mr. John K. Murphy	2
11	Mr. Reginald Faulkner	5
12	Welch's Applehill Farm	5
13	Mississippi Valley Conservation Authority	5
14	Environment Canada	6
15	Mr. Algirdas Povilonis	6
16	Ontario Ministry of Natural Resources	6
17	Canterbury Community Association	6
18	Citizens for Safe Cycling	9
19	Mr. Max Bacon	13
20	Tartan Group Inc.	13
21	Mr. Allan R. Gregory	14
22	Messrs Allan R. Gregory & Paul M. Laughton	14
23	Low, Murchison (for Mr. and Mrs. Eldon Craig)	15
24	Churchill Area Residents' Association	15
25	Westboro Community Association	16
26	Lambert McCarthy	17
27	Proctor and Redfern (for Jockvale Realty)	18
28	Ottawa East Community Association	18
29	City of Kanata	19
30	Soloway, Wright, et. al. (for John Steenbakkers)	23
31	Proctor & Redfern Group (for Taysham Investors)	24
32	Proctor & Redfern Group (for Messrs. Davidson et.al)	24
33	Proctor & Redfern Group (for Messrs. Bradley et.al)	24
34	Mr. Alan Rackow, P.Eng.	25
35	Soloway, Wright, et. al. (for Arnon Development Corporation)	25
36	Soloway, Wright, et. al. (for John Steenbakkers)	25
37	Soloway, Wright, et. al. (for Del Corporation)	26
38	M.M. Dillon Ltd. (for Shenkman Corporation)	26
39	Ontario Ministry of Agriculture and Food	27
40	Soloway, Wright et.al. (for Ivanhoe Inc.)	29
41	Soloway, Wright et.al. (for Trilea Centres Inc.)	30
42	Kimmel, Victor & Ages (for Tanglewood Ottawa Ltd.)	31
43	City of Gloucester	31
44	Kingdon Holdings Limited	37
45	Tartan Group Inc.	37
46	Soloway, Wright et.al. (for Campeau Corporation)	37
47	Mr. Brian Arbuckle	38
48	Landowners of Lots 10-15, Con. I, Huntley	38
49	Ontario Hydro	38
50	Ontario Ministry of Housing	38
51	City of Nepean	38
52	Mr. Bob Avery & Mrs. Ghislaine Brunet	39
53	City of Vanier	39
54	Equity Management International Limited (for J. Freedman)	40
55	W.J. Bell & Son Construction Ltd.	40
56	Mr. Ralph Spratt	40
57	Environment Canada Parks	40
58	Ottawa Pedestrian Citizens Committee	41
59	Mr. Ken Hubert	43
60	Environment Blackburn	43

No.	Submitter	Page
61	Township of Osgoode	44
62	Ontario Ministry of the Environment Southeast Region	44
63	Soloway, Wright et.al. (for Campeau Corporation)	48
64	Mr. Burritt Collins	50
65	Minto Construction Limited	50
66	Federation of Citizens Associations	50
67	Cedarlane Estates	52
68	511376 Ontario Limited	52
69	Ottawa-Carleton Home Builders' Association	52
70	Cummings Cockburn Limited (for Richcraft Homes)	56
71	Marion Seymour, Consultant (for the Bradley Family)	57
72	Marion Seymour, Consultant	57
73	City of Nepean	57
74	Township of Goulbourn	61
75	Perley-Robertson, Panet, et.al. (for Terrace Investments Ltd)	64
76	Cummings Cockburn Limited (for Elsett Realty)	64
77	Carleton Condominium Corporation #11	65
78	Churchill Area Residents' Association	66
79	Carlingwood Action Committee	66
80	Mr. John Teevens	66
81	Orleans South Community Association	66
82	New Edinburgh Community Association	67
83	Glabar Park Community Association	67
84	Ridgeview Community Association	68
85	Proctor & Redfern Group (for Taysham Investors Inc.)	69
86	Ontario Institute of Agrologists - Ottawa Valley Branch	69
87	Township of Cumberland	71
88	Tanglewood Ottawa Limited	78
89	Rideau Front Property Owners	78
90	Dr. R. Sinha	78
91	Action Alta Vista Parkway	79
92	West Carleton Ratepayers Association	79
93	Taxpayers Association of Ottawa-Carleton	81
94	Bell, Baker (for Fine's Flowers Ltd.)	81
95	Soloway, Wright et.al. (for Campeau Corporation)	82
96	Ontario Ministry of Municipal Affairs	82
97	Transport Canada Airport Authority Group	84
98	Hampton-Iona Community Group	84
99	Proctor & Redfern Group (for M. Holitzner Limited)	84
100	Tartan Development Corporation	85
101	Mrs. Barbara McGee	85
102	Mr. Allan R. Gregory	86
103	Ontario Ministry of Municipal Affairs	86
104	Winter Buchanan Associates (for Edward Coates)	86
105	Marion Seymour, Consultant	86
106	Ontario Ministry of Citizenship and Culture - Heritage Br.	86
107	Ontario Ministry of Housing	87
108	Mr. Bob Avery & Mrs. Ghislaine Brunet	87
109	Carlingwood Action Committee	88
110	Mrs. Helen Johansen	89
111	Limebank Holdings	89
112	Soloway, Wright, et. al. (for Famlit Investments et.al.)	90
113	Soloway, Wright, et. al. (for Gib Patterson)	90
114	Soloway, Wright, et. al. (for Cave Investments)	90
115	Soloway, Wright, et. al. (for Arnon Development Corporation	90
116	Ontario Ministry of Natural Resources	91
117	Ms. Bueno	92
118	Mme. Monique Riese	93
119	Perley-Robertson, Panet, et.al. (for Terrace Investments Ltd)	93
120	Mr. Barry Wellar, PhD, MCIP	94
121	Queenswood Heights Community Association	94
122	Mr. W.P. McKinley	97
123	Consumers Gas	97
124	Ottawa-Carleton Home Builders' Association	97
125	National Capital Commission	97

No.	Submitter	Page
126	Ottawa Federation of Housing Cooperatives, Inc.	100
127	Highland Park Ratepayers' Association	102
128	Ms. Marey Gregory	103
129	R.A.M.P.	103
130	Council of Women of Ottawa and Area	104
131	J.L. Richards & Assoc. Ltd. (for Central Canada Exhibition)	105
132	Ms. L. Westell	105
133	Vanier Parkway Extension Committee	105
134	Township of West Carleton	107
135	Mr. Howard Maguire	108
136	Scott & Aylen (for Gloucester Equestrian Centre Ltd.)	108
137	Mr.& Mrs. F.D. Lute	109
138	Colleen Findlay	110
139	City of Vanier	110
140	Mrs. Lillian Hobbs	110
141	Gowling & Henderson (for Ottawa Uplands Limited)	110
142	Minister of Public Works	111
143	J.L. Richards & Assoc. Ltd. (for Central Canada Exhibition)	111
144	Council of Women of Ottawa and Area	111
145	Ottawa Health Sciences Centre Inc.	112
146	Ontario Ministry of Northern Development and Mines	113
147	Kingdon Holdings Limited	113
148	City of Gloucester	113
149	Taxpayers Association of Ottawa-Carleton	113
150	CP Rail	114
151	Ontario Ministry of Municipal Affairs	114
152	Novatech Engineering Consultants Ltd. (for Del Corporation)	114
153	Alta Vista Drive Residents' Association	114
154	Township of Rideau	115
155	Carlingwood Community Association	117
156	Ottawa-Carleton Home Builders' Association	117
157	Lithwick Bros.	118
158	Transport Canada	118
159	Minto Construction Limited	118
160	Township of Osgoode	119
161	Residents near Carlingwood Shopping Ctr.	120
162	City of Ottawa	121

SUMMARY OF BRIEFS

AND STAFF RESPONSE

Brief #1: Mr. Jean J. Comtois, Ontario Ministry of Education

00.0.0.0 00( ) (Point #01)
Acknowledgment only.

Brief #2: Hon. Stewart McInnes, Minister of Public Works (Canada)

00.0.0.0 00( ) (Point #01)
Acknowledgment only.

Brief #3: Mrs. Jean Pigott, National Capital Commission

00.0.0.0 00( ) (Point #01)
Acknowledgment only.

Brief #4: Mr. A. Zembal, Ontario Ministry of Transportation and Communications

00.0.0.0 00( ) A (Points #01 to #03)
G MTC requests that Schedules A, G and H be revised to show the proposed route of Highway 416 (Cedarview Corridor).
H

Schedules A, G and H are not intended to show proposed roads. They show existing provincial highways but only for reference, not policy purposes. The proposed route of Highway 416 is shown on the other schedules of the official plan for information purposes.

Brief #5: Mr. David Makow

05.1.3.3 06(a) (Points #01 to #04)
(b) Supports policies 6a, b, c and d on page 5-3
(c) (pockets of poor land policy in agricultural
(d) areas).

Policies have been reworded but the intent remains.

05.1.3.3 06(a) (Point #05)
Suggests that policy 6a be modified to include a qualifier "...unless such lands are forested and not used commercially, in which case such land can have a rating much better than class 5."

Provision has been made that land of better quality can be included, providing the pocket is predominantly class 5 or poorer.

Brief #6: Mrs. Barbara McGee

00.0.0.0 00( ) AB (Point #01)
N1/4 E1/2 lot 29, Township of Goulbourn now in Kanata. Considers land in her ownership to be too small for cultivation and, because of an expropriation, an irregular shaped lot adjoining commercially-zoned land which is completely isolated by a drainage ditch has been created.

The land east of the Carp River has been included in the urban area. The land west of the Carp River is designated Agricultural Resource. This land has to be considered in the context of all the land between Kanata and Stittsville. It is acknowledged that agricultural operations next to any urban area may suffer from intrusions but this is not reason enough to redesignate such land. Having regard to the need to establish the south urban centre, the transportation facilities potentially available to service the western part of the urban area and the overall supply of vacant urban land, this area is not designated for urban development. As prime farm land which is part of an area of contiguous farming along

the Carp Valley which extends into West Carleton, it is designated Agricultural Resource.

Brief #7: Mr. Pierre Lalonde, Ministry of Community and Social Services

06.2.3.0 00( ) (Point #01)
The area office recognizes there is a shortage of rent-geared-to-income housing. Social Assistance Review Committee will report before the end of 1987 on this.

Receipt of this information is acknowledged.

06.2.6.0 12( ) (Point #02)
The area office supports permitting group homes in all areas where residential uses are permitted.

The policy adopted by Council requires that group homes be permitted in all primarily residential areas.

Brief #8: Mr. Frank Wilson, AMCT, City of Kanata

00.0.0.0 00( ) (Point #01)
Acknowledgment only.

Brief #9: Mr. M.J. O'Connor

00.0.0.0 00( ) A (Point #01)
The property lot 8, concession 7, Rideau Township should be general rural rather than agricultural resource because the land is not suitable for agriculture.

This change has been made in the official plan adopted by Regional Council.

Brief #10: Mr. John K. Murphy

01.0.0.0 00( ) (Point #01)
Support for the draft official plan document with exception of the matters discussed below.

See responses to other points in this brief.

01.3.0.0 00( ) (Point #02)
Agrees with projections of dwelling type to 2001 but concerned that in the longer term there will be a greater desire for higher density dwellings by older people than has been projected.

Projections of dwelling type are done by projecting the number of households in various age groups and the demand by dwelling type of these age groups. In particular, households with a head of household aged 65 or older are projected to demand dwelling unit types in the following proportions: 35% single detached, 10% multiples, 55% apartments. In 1986 this age group occupied 40% single detached, 11% multiples and 49% apartments.

02.1.5.0 07( ) (Point #03)
Concerned about whether jobs will actually locate in the urban centres outside the greenbelt.

Total jobs in the urban centres outside the greenbelt grew from 4,390 in 1976 to 13,600 in 1986. The Official Plan adopted by Regional Council includes a number of policies to encourage continued employment growth. There is a general policy in Part 2 to provide adequate transportation and other regional services to employment areas as a matter of priority and a

policy in Part 11 giving priority to provision of transitway stations in the town centres of the urban centres.

02.1.7.0 00( ) (Point #04)
Concerned about the safety of the transportation system regarding bicycles and pedestrians. The word, "safe", should rot be used.

The legal responsibilities of the Region and area municipalities are established in provincial legislation such as the Regional Municipality of Ottawa-Carleton Act and the Municipal Act. Safety is a valid objective for a transportation system. Deletion of the word "safe" from the Official Plan is unlikely to diminish the Region's legal responsibilities.

10.1.2.0 00( ) (Point #05)
Would like the official plan or an appendix to include the five-year capital budget.

Five year capital budgets are revised annually and are changed too frequently for inclusion in a long-term official plan. Policy 8 in Part 2 of the adopted Official Plan requires Council to review annually the five year capital program for the provision of watermain and trunk sewer services against the objective of having a ten year supply of serviced urban residential land. In this way Council is provided with the opportunity to consider changing circumstances.

01.7.2.0 07( ) (Point #06)
As expressed, this is too weak. The Region should refuse to provide services to a development until the developer properly plans an area with all levels of government.

This policy is unchanged in the revised official plan adopted by Regional Council. The policy addresses the proposals of the provincial or federal governments, not of a private developer. Regional Council cannot require anything of the provincial or federal governments; it can only request.

01.7.2.0 09( ) (Point #07)
Suggests the five-year review period is too short; suggests it be a six-year period so alternate councils would deal with a review of the plan.

The five year review period is a provision in the Planning Act, 1983 and cannot be changed by Regional Council. The policy adopted by Regional Council in the revised official plan says "At regular intervals of not more than five years..." which reflects the wording of Section 26 "not less frequently than every five years."

03.2.3.1 03( ) (Point #08)
Place d'Orleans should be included in the list of regional shopping centres.

The list of Regional Shopping Centres in Section 3.2.3.1 of the Official Plan as adopted by Regional Council, pertains only to Regional Shopping Centres inside the greenbelt exclusive

of the Central Area. Place D'Orleans is outside the greenbelt. Place D'Orleans is designated a Regional Shopping Centre on Schedule B in the Region's new Official Plan.

03.2.3.1 04( ) (Point #09)
Kanata Town Centre "or" Orleans Town Centre should be changed to read "and/or".

The Official Plan adopted by Regional Council provides for a review of the size limits of Regional Shopping Centres inside the greenbelt when a Regional Shopping Centre exists in either the Kanata Town Centre "or" the Orleans Town Centre. A change of wording to "and/or" would not change the impact of the policy, i.e. development of a Regional Shopping Centre in one of the two Town Centres is sufficient to trigger a review.

03.3.3.0 01( ) (Point #10)
The plan should provide for hospitals to be built in Kanata and Orleans so that the new plan does not need an amendment when the specific proposal to locate a hospital in these areas is contemplated.

The Ottawa-Carleton Regional District Health Council advises that sites have not been selected for hospitals in Kanata and Orleans. It is therefore premature to designate sites in the official plan at this time.

05.3.5.0 00( ) A (Points #11 & #12)
B Petrie Island should be designated conservation area (Natural environment area)?

Petrie Island is designated Urban Area on Schedule A and Waterfront Open Space on Schedule B. Policy 3a) i) of Section 8.3.3 has been expanded to ensure that any uses in Waterfront Open Space designations will not significantly impact the conservation values of the areas.

06.2.6.0 12( ) (Point #13)
Group homes should be permitted in residential and industrial areas so that Cumberland does not have to amend its by-law.

The policy on group homes requires that they be permitted in all areas zoned "primarily" for residential uses. This does not preclude permitting them in other areas as well, e.g. industrial. The Township of Cumberland's by-law provisions for group homes do not have to be amended.

10.1.2.0 01( ) (Point #14)
75,000 limit should be changed to 90,000.

The East Urban Centre is to be planned and serviced on the basis of accommodating between 25,000 and 33,000 dwelling units at full development. The reference to 75,000 persons has been deleted.

10.1.2.0 05( ) (Point #15)
Requests clarification on whether the figure for Notre Dame Des Champs is valid.

This figure is the total amount of development that can be accommodated.

11.2.2.0 00( ) (Point #16)
Questions whether Tenth Line from St. Joseph to Innes Road should be a Tier 1 facility.

There is no "tiering" of road improvements in the official plan adopted by Regional Council. Council will determine the priority of improvements to the regional road system in its five-

year capital budget forecast in the context of monitoring reports and other indicators of need.

11.2.2.0 00( ) (Point #17)
Asks whether the Region intends to extend the Ottawa River Parkway (East) to Regional Road 47.

On Schedule C1 of the official plan adopted by Regional Council, the Ottawa River Parkway (East) is shown extending east to Regional Road 57 (Trim Road). Thus far, however, the National Capital Commission has not agreed to this proposal.

11.2.4.0 00( ) (Point #18)
Seeks clarification on the width of the Tenth Line.

North of St. Joseph Blvd. Tenth Line Road will be a four lane divided urban arterial. Between St. Joseph and Innes Road the right of way in the official plan adopted by Regional Council is sufficient for a six lane divided urban arterial.

11.4.2.0 19( ) (Point #19)
Supports the extension of the transitway to Orleans Town Centre in order to encourage job creation.

In the official plan adopted by Regional Council transitway stations in the town centres of the urban centres outside the greenbelt are a first priority and extension of the transitway system to Orleans and Kanata is a second priority.

Brief #11: Mr. Reginald Faulkner

00.0.0.0 00( ) A (Point #01)
E1/2 lot 24 concession 9 Township of Goulbourn. He would like the whole parcel, not part of the parcel designated "marginal" (general rural area).

This change has been made.

Brief #12: Mr. David Welch, Welch's Applehill Farm

02.2.0.0 03( ) (Point #01)
Supports south urban centre because of difficulties of farming in the area.

The Official Plan adopted by Regional Council designates a south urban centre in Nepean and Gloucester.

Brief #13: Sandy Hay, Mississippi Valley Conservation Authority

07.2.1.0 01( ) (Points #01 to #07)
02 No objection. The policies dealing with flood-
03 plains reflect proposed provincial policies.
04
05 *This approach has been maintained.*
06
07

Brief #14: E. Neville Ward, Environment Canada

01.1.0.0 00( ) (Point #01)
Asks that the federal policy on land use be included in the final Regional plan.

The revised official plan adopted by Regional Council does not include the Federal Policy on Land Use, a policy which is intended to guide federal policies and programs and the management of federal land. It would create confusion if embodied in its entirety in the regional official plan. The regional official plan does attempt to recognize the roles, jurisdictions and interests of the various levels of government in Ottawa-Carleton.

Brief #15: Mr. Algirdas Povilonis

00.0.0.0 00( ) A (Point #01)
Relates to Lot 15, west 1/2 concession 4, Township of Goulbourn. Should be designated marginal resource (general rural area) rather than agricultural resource.

This change had already been incorporated into the original draft and has been maintained in the final Plan adopted by Regional Council.

Brief #16: J.D. Murray, Ontario Ministry of Natural Resources

00.0.0.0 00( ) (Point #01)
Acknowledgment only.

Brief #17: Mr. Wayne Bond, Canterbury Community Association

02.2.1.0 00( ) (Point #01)
Part 2. Support for Regional Development Strategy (policies 1-8).

The regional development strategy in the Plan adopted by Regional Council has been modified from the May 1987 draft version in several ways. There is no distinction between Stage 1 and Stage 2 lands in the South Urban Centre. The policy concerning a joint planning study for the South Urban Centre has been replaced by a policy permitting urban development subject to the approval of a regional official amendment, which establishes policies for the South Urban Centre at a similar level of detail to policies for the Kanata and Orleans urban centres, and of amendments to the Nepean and Gloucester official plans. The maximum dwellings permitted in Kanata has been increased from 30,000 to 35,000; in Orleans and the South Urban Centre from 30,000 to 33,000 and in Stittsville from 4,000 to 6,000. Job maximums were increased correspondingly.

03.1.3.1 01( ) (Points #02 to #04)
02
03
Support the policies on Central Area development.

The Official Plan adopted by Regional Council contains the same policies for the central area as the May 1987 draft version.

03.4.0.0 00( ) (Point #05)
Support for community planning.

There are no major changes to Section 3.4 between the May 1987 version and the revised official plan adopted by Regional Council.

03.3.3.0 01( ) (Point #06)
02
03
Support for "regional scale facilities" (major community facilities). (policies 1-3).

The revised official plan adopted by Regional Council contains the same policies for Major Community Facilities as the May 1987 draft with one small exception (deletion of the criterion re land use compatibility, since this is the responsibility of area municipalities to determine).

10.3.2.0 02( ) (Points #07 to #09)
Support for waste recycling

The Plan adopted by Council retains the policy on waste recycling.

02.2.0.0 02( ) (Point #10)
Support for development of the south urban community in Nepean before development of Leitrim or south of the airport.

The official plan adopted by Regional Council does not contain any staging of the Nepean portion of the South Urban Centre versus the portion south of the airport or Leitrim. Council has indicated in Policy 9 of Part 2 that it will not incur costs for the construction of infrastructure relating to development in Leitrim, so the timing of the Leitrim urban area will depend on the decisions of the local municipality (Gloucester) and developers concerning the provision of infrastructure.

11.2.2.0 00( ) (Point #11)
Alta Vista as a Tier 2 road is supported. When it is constructed it should be developed with recreation development and landscaping to create a linear park. And it should not be used for truck traffic.

The Alta Vista Parkway corridor will be appropriately landscaped and will include bicycle paths. As it is a proposed Regional Road it will be designed to carry all types of traffic. Whether it is a truck route or not will be a Council decision. There is no "tiering" of road improvements in the official plan adopted by Regional Council.

11.5.0.0 00( ) F (Point #12)
Support for bicycle path corridors in Alta Vista east and Alta Vista west corridors. Shared cost venture between RMOC and NCC is suggested.

Designation of bicycle corridors in Alta Vista east and west corridors was included in the Plan adopted by Council. The question of who will pay for the bike paths has not been addressed.

11.5.0.0 00( ) F (Point #13)
Support for the designation of major bicycle corridors in draft official plan (Schedule F).

Schedule F, incorporating major bicycle corridors, was included in the Plan adopted by Council.

00.0.0.0 00( ) E (Point #14)
Support for development of the transitway as depicted on Schedule E.

The only change in Schedule E between the May 1987 draft Plan and the Plan adopted by Regional Council is that a distinction is made in the adopted Plan between those portions of

the transitway which are already built (existing) and those yet to be built (proposed).

03.4.3.0 07( ) (Point #15)
Support for policy favouring increased development near transitway stations.

The official plan adopted by Regional Council continues to promote increased development in the vicinity of transitway stations.

03.4.3.0 03( ) (Point #16)
Support for policy on the grouping of community facilities.

The policy on grouping of community facilities is included without change in the official plan adopted by Regional Council.

03.5.3.0 00( ) (Point #17)
Would like to see the official plan contain a range of compatible uses which could be considered for the greenbelt which would primarily be of an open air recreation and leisure nature, but could involve restaurants or services that support leisure activities.

In the preface of Section 3.5.3 of the regional official plan as adopted by Council, there is a discussion of land uses deemed compatible with the greenbelt (e.g. open air recreation).

03.5.3.0 00( ) (Point #18)
Support for the greenbelt lands as a means of structuring the urban area into distinct communities.

The Official Plan adopted by Regional Council continues to show the greenbelt as an element of urban structure on Schedule B.

06.2.1.0 00( ) (Points #19 to #22)
Support for a stronger regional role in housing policy, particularly in the establishment of targets for assisted housing. City of Ottawa should not be providing 91% of the assisted housing.

Policy 1 of Section 6.2.1 provides for the establishment of region-wide targets for assisted housing in the Regional Housing Statement. The Regional Housing Statement also distributes these housing targets among the area municipalities. The last Update for the period 1984 to 1988 estimated that approximately 72% of the target for assisted family units and 70% of the assisted senior citizen units were required in the City of Ottawa. For the period 1982 to 1987, 76% of all new assisted units were in the City of Ottawa.

06.2.1.0 04( ) (Point #23)
All area municipalities should provide their fair share of assisted housing to be implemented through the regional housing statement.

The Plan adopted by Council provides for detailed aspects of housing policies to be addressed in the Regional Housing Statement (RHS). This issue will be discussed in the RHS Update to be initiated in 1988.

06.2.3.0 07(d) (Point #24)
This policy contains no safeguards with respect to the impact on the character of existing neighbourhoods or the satisfaction of other legitimate community planning goals.

Policy 7 encourages local municipalities to amend existing by-laws and regulations, "if deemed desirable" by local councils. The wording provides flexibility for local councils to consider the impact on the character of existing neighbourhoods, as well as planning goals other than reducing the cost of housing, when making these decisions.

06.2.6.0 12( ) (Point #25)
Support for permitting group homes in all the residential areas.

The policy on group homes requires that they be permitted in all primarily residential areas.

06.2.6.0 12( ) (Point #26)
Institutionalized group homes of more than ten people should not be permitted in single family residential areas.

The preamble to Policy 12 (Section 6.2.6) defines a group home as a licensed residence for three to ten persons, exclusive of staff. The policy would therefore not require local by-laws to permit homes of a larger size unless the local municipality wished to do so.

06.2.6.0 12( ) (Point #27)
Different siting criteria for different types of group homes should be permitted. This policy should be included in the Regional Official Plan so there is consistency between area municipalities.

The policy adopted by Council states that zoning by-laws adopted by local municipalities may regulate separation distances between group homes and the location of certain types of group homes. The specific criteria applying to the location of certain types of group homes within primarily residential areas are a matter best decided by local municipalities.

Brief #18: Mr. Sid Board, Citizens for Safe Cycling

02.1.7.0 00( ) (Point #01)
The words "bicycle" and "bicycling" should be replaced with the word "cycle" or "cycling" throughout the plan.

In the Official Plan adopted by Regional Council, the word "bicycling" has been replaced by "cycling". However, "bicycle" is still used rather than "cycle" to avoid any suggestion that the reference includes motorcycles.

02.1.7.0 00( ) (Point #02)
Paragraph 7 be changed by adding "cycling also provides an efficient and economical method of transportation for those who choose not to use a motor vehicle and for those who are not in a position to use a motor vehicle."

It is agreed that cycling is an efficient and economical transportation alternative, but this addition is not included in the Official Plan adopted by Regional Council. The purpose of the

paragraph is to explain the relative roles of major roads and public transit.

02.1.7.0 00( )

(Point #03)
Paragraph 12 be changed by adding "the regional road system will also be improved at every opportunity to meet recognised standards for use by cyclists".

This suggestion has not been added to Section 2.1.7 of the Official Plan adopted by Regional Council. However, Policy 25 in Section 11.5 states "...Where feasible, regional roads shall be adapted to provide safer travel for bicycles".

03.1.2.0 06( )

(Point #04)
In addition to objective 6 a new objective is proposed as follows "to provide a safe and convenient network for cycle travel incorporating the regional road system improved to recognised standards for cycle use together with major routes reserved for cyclists (shown on Schedule F).

The proposed objective was not added to the section on Employment Areas in the Official Plan adopted by Council. Cycling and pedestrian policies are addressed in Section 11.5, which articulates the Regional policy recognizing bicycles as a form of transportation for commuting and recreation on existing and proposed Regional roads and transitway/utility corridors. Moreover, the Official Plan indicates Council's commitment to providing for safer travel of bicycles on existing Regional roads as well as protecting for and enhancing the continuity the Major Bicycle Corridor system by placing approval conditions on development applications.

03.1.0.0 00( )
3.2
3.3
3.4

(Points #05 to #08)
The discussion and objectives in 3.4 are also applicable to sections 3.1, 3.2 and 3.3. Section 3.4 should precede sections 3.1, 3.2 and 3.3.

Sections 3.1 to 3.4 in the revised official plan adopted by Regional Council are in the same order as in the May 1987 draft. Section 3.4 General Urban Areas contains cross references to the sections on Employment Areas and Shopping Facilities and it was considered desirable that these sections be presented first. Many of the ideas in Section 3.4 concerning the relationship between land uses and transportation are also reflected in the preceding sections, e.g. the requirement for compact and pedestrian oriented development at Employment Centres and the locational criteria concerning road capacity and transit service for employment areas, shopping facilities and major community facilities.

03.4.2.0 00( )

(Point #09)
3rd paragraph be changed by adding "Cycling in particular offers an economical and efficient, self-contained method of transportation."

The revised official plan adopted by Regional Council does not include the addition. The purpose of the paragraph is to explain the basis for a regional interest in the various modes of travel.

03.4.3.0 00( )

(Point #10)
Replace the last sentence of the 2nd para with "attention is drawn to the need to provide a safe and convenient network for cycle travel. This network should comprise the regional road system, improved to recognized standards for cycle use together with major routes reserved for cyclists".

The proposed wording was not added to the official plan adopted by Regional Council. Section 3.4.3 deals with the relationship between land use and transportation in areas designated General Urban Area, whereas the proposal deals with provision for bicycle travel throughout the urban area.

03.4.3.0 02( )

(Point #11)
Replace Policy 2 with "a safe and convenient network for cycle travel shall be provided incorporating the regional road system improved to recognized standards for cycle use together with major routes reserved for cyclists (shown on Schedule F).

Policy 2 is unchanged between the May 1987 draft and the official plan adopted by Regional Council. In the fifth paragraph of section 11.2.1 concerning Roads, an amendment was made to say "Where appropriate and feasible, the right-of-way of regional roads should include sufficient space to accommodate... bicycle paths". In addition, policy 23 of Part 11 includes the following, "Where feasible, regional roads shall be adapted to provide safer travel for bicycles". Any stronger commitment was not considered feasible in an era of limited resources and in an area of mixed jurisdiction between area municipalities and the regional municipality.

08.3.0.0 01( )
02
03
04
05
06
07
08

(Point #12)
Support for river corridor policies. Policies 1-8

This section has not been changed.

08.4.0.0 00( )

(Point #13)
The word "drivers" in the 5th line of section 8.4 should be changed to "road users".

This has been done.

11.1.0.0 07( )

(Point #14)
Add the following objective "to encourage the use of cycles by the provision of a safe and convenient cycle travel network incorporating both improved regional roads and major cycle routes" (shown on schedule F).

The proposed objective was not included in the official plan adopted by Regional Council, however the Plan does include policies to adapt regional roads to provide safer travel for bicycles and to protect and enhance the system of Major Bicycle Corridors on Schedule F.

11.1.0.0 00( )

(Point #15)
Add the following between the 5th and 6th paragraphs, "The use of cycles should be encouraged because cycling provides a mode of transporta-

tion that is both efficient and economical for those who choose not to use a motor vehicle and for those who are not in a position to use a motor vehicle."

This paragraph has not been included in the official plan adopted by Regional Council. The fifth paragraph makes reference to encouraging cycling to conserve energy (fuel).

11.2.0.0 03( ) (Point #16)
The following be added to the end of objective 3 "..... including cyclists".

This addition is not included in the official plan adopted by Regional Council.

11.4.1.0 00( ) (Point #17)
Add the following to the second paragraph "at those locations where the safety of other road users particularly cyclists will not be diminished".

This addition has not been made. Where there is potential conflict between cyclists and transit, Council's policy is to give priority to transit, as indicated in policy 22 of Part 11"... Council will not support the use of bicycles in bus lanes on regional roads". This is a reasonable approach given the relative numbers of cyclists and transit passengers.

11.4.1.0 13( ) (Point #18)
Replace policy 13 with "Council shall provide, where appropriate and where the safety of other road users particularly cyclists will not be diminished, preferential treatment for transit vehicles on regional roads".

This change has not been made in the official plan adopted by Regional Council. Council's policy is to give priority to transit, as indicated in policy 22 of Part 11"... Council will not support the use of bicycles in bus lanes on regional roads". This is a reasonable approach given the relative numbers of cyclists and transit passengers.

11.5.0.0 00( ) (Point #19)
The writers would prefer to see bicycling and pedestrian policies separated.

Although there is only one section (11.5) on Bicycling and Pedestrian Policy, the individual policies in that section deal with cycling and pedestrians separately.

11.5.0.0 22( ) (Point #20)
Replace the second sentence with "regional roads shall be improved to recognized standards for cycle users at every opportunity."

This has not been done. The suggested wording is too sweeping a statement of priority in a situation where there are a variety of competing needs for limited resources.

11.5.0.0 22( ) (Point #21)
Replace the last sentence of policy 22 with "where bus lanes are implemented, the safety of cyclists shall not be diminished. Council will not in general support the use of cycles in bus lanes on regional roads."

This has not been done. It is not possible to promise that the implementation of bus lanes will have no impact on the safety of cyclists.

Brief #19: Mr. Max Bacon

09.2.1.0 00( ) (Point #01)
The Region should be much more concerned with the visual impact of its works and be very positive in the statements in its official plan.

Policy 2 addresses this issue.

09.2.0.0 01( ) (Point #02)
Instead of "recognising" the need it should "ensure" a high quality etc.

This has been so changed.

09.2.0.0 02( ) (Point #03)
It should not "protect where feasible" but rather "protect and enhance".

This has been changed to "protect and enhance whenever possible".

09.2.0.0 03( ) (Point #04)
It should not just "consider" but it should "enhance".

The policy states that how the visual environment may be enhanced will be one of the factors to be considered in undertaking an environmental assessment but there is no prior commitment that this will "enhance".

09.2.0.0 04( ) (Point #05)
The region should not just look at scenic routes but all roads.

If policies for the designated scenic routes prove successful, consideration can be given to applying them to other roads.

09.2.0.0 00( ) (Point #06)
The region has approval powers of subdivisions and can exercise a considerable influence on the aesthetics of development. There should be a statement in the plan about urban design including landscaping, signs, the relationship of buildings to streets, parking lots etc., in respect of municipal undertakings and private projects.

As the Region has very little direct influence on the aesthetics of development, it is not felt that the official plan is the proper document to exhort others. The matters listed are regulated by zoning by-laws and site plan control which are area municipal responsibilities.

Brief #20: Mr. John O'Connor, Tartan Group Inc.

00.0.0.0 00( ) AB (Point #01)
Lot 16 conc. 2 Rideau Front City of Nepean and lots 15 and 16 conc. 1 Rideau Front, City of Nepean. Support for Stage 1 urban area designation.

This land is designated Urban Area. Reference to staging has been removed in the official plan adopted by Regional Council.

02.2.0.0 02( ) (Point #02)
Lands in the Barrhaven Area should be approved for immediate development by 1989.

The Official Plan adopted by Regional Council, permits the servicing and development of an initial phase of the South Urban Centre adjacent to Barrhaven provided that the location and size of such phase does not adversely affect matters of regional concern or require Regional expenditure for trunk sewers (see policy 4 in Part 2).

02.2.0.0 02( ) (Point #03)
Support for stage 1 development in Nepean portion of the centre.

The Official Plan adopted by Regional Council does not distinguish between Stage 1 and Stage 2 areas in the south urban centre. However it is intended to extend the trunk sewers first to the Nepean portion.

Brief #21: Mr. Allan R. Gregory

03.2.3.1 02( ) (Point #01)
This policy appears to apply only to new regional shopping centres and therefore not to Carlingwood. Is this an oversight?

The policy in the official plan adopted by Council has been revised to apply to both new and existing Regional Shopping Centres. The ability of the adjacent road system to accommodate the anticipated traffic will be a requirement for all proposals to amend Regional Shopping Centre policies.

03.2.3.1 02( ) (Point #02)
Questions whether or not the traffic consultants undertaking traffic impact studies should be retained by the region as is proposed for market studies rather than be retained by a developer.

The Official Plan adopted by Regional Council does not require that consultants for traffic impact studies be retained by the Region. Regional Council is satisfied that traffic impact studies carried out by professional engineers using agreed upon factors and parameters are credible tools that vary little regardless of who the client is.

Brief #22: Messrs. Allan R. Gregory & Paul M. Laughton

03.1.3.0 07( ) 11 (Points #01 & #02)
The question is raised as to whether section 40(8) of the Planning Act, 1983 allows the region to require parking facilities and access as well as road widenings.

Section 40(8) of the Planning Act, 1983 allows the Region to require parking facilities, access and road widenings where land abuts a highway under the Region's jurisdiction. While the Region does, as a matter of practice, require appropriate access and road widenings to be provided, the Region defers the responsibility for parking facilities to the local municipalities. Local municipalities are best equipped to deal with parking facilities through their respective zoning by-laws.

03.2.3.1 03( ) 04 (Points #03 & #04)
Since Carlingwood is over 35,000 sq. metres but does not meet all the criteria in policy 2, there is an argument for freezing development i.e., eliminating further expansion permitted in policy 3 and altering policy 4 so that

Carlingwood is excluded from the reviews provided for under the policies.

A permitted gross leasable area (GLA) is not established for Carlingwood Shopping Centre in the Official Plan adopted by Regional Council. The City of Ottawa is doing a zoning review. Trilea Centres Inc. has agreed not to submit any site plan proposal for a period of eighteen months while the City completes its study. When study results are available Regional Council will establish a limit for Carlingwood.

Brief #23: Mr. Gordon J. McCay, Low, Murchison (for Mr. and Mrs. Eldon Craig)

00.0.0.0 00( ) AB (Point #01)
West 1/2 lot 29 conc. 11 (formerly in the Township of Goulbourn). Situated in the neck of land between Stittsville and Kanata, because of surrounding urbanisation, operation of the farm is increasingly difficult. Their investment in the farm is already substantially at risk because of conflicting land uses. Non-farming residents already create problems. Farming uses are no longer viable. The request is for them to be designated either urban area or, if planning principles require an open space between Kanata and Stittsville, that their land be acquired.

This land has to be considered in the context of all the land between Kanata and Stittsville. It is acknowledged that agricultural operations next to any urban area may suffer from intrusions but this is not reason enough to redesignate such land or for it to be publicly acquired. Having regard to the need to establish the south urban centre, the transportation facilities potentially available to service the western part of the urban area and the overall supply of vacant urban land, this area is not designated for urban development. As prime farm land which is part of an area of contiguous farming along the Carp Valley which extends into West Carleton, it is designated Agricultural Resource.

Brief #24: Ms. Lorraine M. Booth, Churchill Area Residents' Association

00.0.0.0 00( ) C1 (Point #01)
Support for the Kirkwood Avenue extension because of the future growth in the surrounding area, the need to provide for truck traffic on Kirkwood, and because it already intersects with the Queensway.

The Kirkwood Avenue extension from Richmond Rd. to Scott Street is in the official plan adopted by Regional Council.

00.0.0.0 00( ) C1 (Point #02)
Support for the Scott Street Extension.

The Scott Street extension is in the official plan adopted by Regional Council.

11.2.2.0 00( ) (Point #03)
Request for Kirkwood Avenue to be listed as a tier 1 priority

There is no "tiering" of road improvements in the official plan adopted by Regional Council. Council will determine the priority of improvements to the regional road system in its five-year capital budget forecast in the context of

monitoring reports and other indicators of need. The need and timing for the Kirkwood Avenue extension is primarily dependent on the timing of high density development on lands north of Scott Street.

Brief #25: Mr. Rick Robinson, Westboro Community Association

00.0.0.0 00( ) C1 (Point #01)
Support for the widening for the Prince of Wales Drive and the Champagne Arterial.

These road proposals are included in the official plan adopted by Regional Council.

00.0.0.0 00( ) C1 (Point #02)
Support for the extension of Kirkwood Avenue.

The Kirkwood Avenue extension from Richmond Rd. to Scott Street is in the official plan adopted by Regional Council.

11.2.2.0 00( ) (Point #03)
The extension of Kirkwood Avenue should be carried out as soon as possible (Tier 1?)

There is no "tiering" of road improvements in the official plan adopted by Regional Council. Council will determine the priority of improvements to the regional road system in its five-year capital budget forecast in the context of monitoring reports and other indicators of need. The need and timing for the Kirkwood Avenue extension is primarily dependent on the timing of high density development on lands north of Scott Street.

11.2.2.0 00( ) (Point #04)
Request for regional and city governments and the community association to study solutions to the traffic situation in this area.

The type of study requested is more appropriate for local municipal government. An area study of Westboro was carried out by the City of Ottawa in the mid 1970s.

06.2.3.0 07( ) (Point #05)
Concern that the regional government is becoming involved in the promotion of infill housing.

Policy 7 of Part 6 encourages local municipalities "to investigate periodically how to reduce the cost of housing," and suggests possible means, none of which specifically include or make reference to "infill housing". Suggested means of smaller lots, greater flexibility in the siting of houses (e.g. zero lot-line developments), and revised standards in the design of streets, sidewalks and other improvements are primarily directed toward new subdivision development on "raw" land.
The fourth suggestion (Policy 7d), increased use or intensification of the existing housing stock, is intended to encourage local by-laws to permit such increased use by, for example, allowing boarders and the creation of small apartments in existing larger dwellings which may now be occupied by only one or two residents. By these means, the supply of affordable accommodation, particularly for single person and elderly households, would be increased.
The policy specifically recognizes that zoning by-laws and other detailed regulations affecting infill housing as well as the above suggestions

are matters for the local municipality to decide. Any resulting changes to existing by-laws are recognized as a matter for the local municipality to decide "if deemed desirable".

05.1.3.0 01( ) (Points #06 to #14)
02 Support policies to limit rural housing develop-
03 ment to ensure preservation of existing farmlands.
04
05 *This policy direction has been maintained.*
06
07
08

06.2.6.0 12( ) (Point #15)
Support this policy as it will result in more equitable distribution of group homes.

The policy requiring that group homes be permitted in all primarily residential areas was adopted by Council.

06
09.3.0.0 07( ) (Points #16 to #21)
08 Support proposed policies to protect and enhance
09 heritage sites that the Region owns and to support
10 other agencies in their efforts to protect heritage
11 sites.

The policy direction has been maintained.

00.0.0.0 00( ) E (Point #22)
If the Byron Avenue transitway is required it is hoped you will work closely with the Westboro Community Association to minimize the impact on the area.

The Byron Avenue Transitway will have to meet the requirements of the Environmental Assessment Act which places great emphasis on minimizing impacts. In addition, when Council dealt with the new official plan, it approved a motion directing staff to identify an at grade alternative transit route on or adjacent to the Western Parkway.

11.0.0.0 00( ) (Point #23)
The Plan should emphasise the importance of the continued regional policy of maintaining the existing inner core road network.

The official plan adopted by Regional Council does not explicitly address the issue of road maintenance. However, the transportation objectives concerning levels of service and accessibility can only be achieved by maintaining the existing road network as well as adding to it. The Region follows a program of preventive maintenance (such as pavement overlays) for its road system.

Brief #26: Lambert McCarthy

00.0.0.0 00( ) A (Point #01)
Lot 13 concession 1 Rideau Township. Land should not be agricultural resource but should be general rural area. Lots 11, 12 and 13 and most of lot 14 are certainly not agricultural resource area.

This land is part of a large block of mostly class 2, 3 and 4 land, most of which is being farmed. Agricultural Resource is the most appropriate designation.

00.0.0.0 00( ) A (Point #02)
Gravel deposits in concession A are not on lots 11 and 12 as shown on the regional map but on 12 and 13 with an active license gravel pit on lot 13.

Schedule A does not indicate a gravel deposit on lot 11 - only on lot 12. It is agreed there is a licensed pit on lot 13 but it is not designated on Schedule A as it does not contain high quality material.

Brief #27: Mr. M.J. Bacon, Proctor and Redfern (for Jockvale Realty)

02.2.0.0 03( ) AB (Point #01)
We own part of lots 7 through 12, Concession II, Rideau Front, City of Nepean. General support for the south urban centre.

The Official Plan adopted by Regional Council provides for the south urban centre.

02.2.0.0 03( ) AB (Point #02)
Support for the development of the whole of the south urban centre in the City of Nepean, i.e. south of the Jock as well as north of the Jock.

The official plan adopted by Regional Council provides for development of the south urban centre in both Nepean and Gloucester. Policy 5 in Part 2 establishes a maximum of 22,000 dwelling units and 29,000 jobs for the Nepean portion of the south urban centre. Whether this will require land south of the Jock River will be determined in planning studies which will result in amendments to the regional official plan (to provide policies of similar detail to those for Kanata and Orleans) and the City of Nepean's official plan.

02.2.0.0 03( ) (Point #03)
Supports and will participate in the planning study contemplated in policy 3.

Policy 3 in the Official Plan adopted by Regional Council no longer refers to a joint planning study. However, it requires an amendment to the regional official plan to establish policies for the south urban centre at a similar level of detail to the regional policies for the Kanata and Orleans urban centres, before urban development may proceed.

Brief #28: Elizabeth Chisholm, Ottawa East Community Association

00.0.0.0 00( ) C1 (Point #01)
Oppose improvements in the Queensway Corridor (Queensway upgrade). Staff should be directed to complete a proper analysis of all costs and benefits.

The Queensway upgrade is the only opportunity which has been identified for increasing road capacity in this corridor and is included in the official plan adopted by Regional Council. Inclusion in the official plan protects for the possibility of developing the Queensway upgrade. The suggested cost-benefit studies are appropriate at a future date when implementation is beign considered, possibly through the application of the Environmental Assessment Act.

00.0.0.0 00( ) C1 (Point #02)
Insufficient information has been provided on the Parkway and the Nicholas-Industrial connection.

The Ottawa-Carleton Official Plan Review Transportation Component report, December 1986 presents travel demand forecasts which demonstrate the requirement for additional capacity in these corridors and hence the prudence of protecting for the possibility of the Parkway and a new bridge across the Rideau River.

11.1.0.0 00( ) (Point #03)
There is insufficient consideration of alternatives to reduce dependency on cars and promote other forms of mass transit other than the transitway.

Several aspects of the official plan adopted by Regional Council will contribute to reduced dependency on cars, e.g. the emphasis on provision of opportunities to live close to the place of work and the provision for bicycle and pedestrian travel in General Urban Areas. The choice of transitways as the most appropriate rapid transit system for Ottawa-Carleton was made after lengthy and detailed study in the 1970s.

11.1.0.0 00( ) C2 (Point #04)
The suggested right-of-way of Main Street is 20 meters. This is supported but staff should be directed to study the possibility of reducing the road width so as to allow the widening of the sidewalks.

The right-of-way for Main Street is 20 metres in the official plan adopted by Regional Council, which reflects the decision made in the context of Amendment 64 to the approved regional official plan. At that time staff indicated that 20 metres did not provide any opportunity to widen sidewalks, since it is intended to maintain four lanes. Main Street is an important link in the major road system, connecting to Smyth Road by way of the McIlraith bridge over the Rideau River and providing access from one side of the Queensway to the other.

00.0.0.0 00( ) B (Point #05)
Brantwood Park and Springhurst Park should be designated waterfront open space.

Urban river corridor lands in public ownership are designated Waterfront Open Space where they form part of a continuous linear system or are large enough to be regionally significant (e.g. Brewer Park, Vincent Massey Park). Brantwood and Springhurst parks are too small for designation in the regional official plan. They may be protected by designation in the local official plan.

Brief #29: Ms. Carol Timusk, City of Kanata

01.3.0.0 00( ) (Point #01)
There is contradiction concerning the overall amount of land designated for urban development.

The perceived "contradiction" arises from differing judgments as to what amount of land constitutes a designation "greatly in excess of needs" or provides "a suitable margin of

surplus". Regional Council has provided in the revised official plan for an amount of designated urban land which exceeds the forecast requirement for developed urban land in 2011. Although Council will consider the need to review the Plan at least once every five years, it is hoped that a comprehensive review will not be required for ten years, i.e. beginning in the mid 1990s with approval as late as 2001. In order to be certain that the designated urban land supply does not decline to less than 10 years supply, it is prudent to designate in excess of projected 2011 requirements.

02.1.6.0 11( )

(Point #02)
Disagree with the 10-year residential land supply objective. Concern that this will mean the extension of services to Barrhaven before Kanata and Orleans reach population thresholds of 75,000.

The revised Official Plan adopted by Regional Council contains the objective of maintaining a minimum of 10 years supply of residential land with trunk services, calculated on a regional basis. This provides for orderly market operation. Part 10 also contains a policy which commits Regional Council to providing specific trunk sewers to Kanata and Orleans before any Regional expenditure on trunk sewers to the south urban centre.

02.2.0.0 03( )

(Point #03)
Suggests the study proceed and the regional official plan be amended when the additional lands to be designated are identified.

Policy 3 in the Official Plan adopted by Regional Council no longer refers to a joint planning study. However, it requires an amendment to the regional Official Plan to establish policies for the south centre at a similar level of detail to the regional policies for the Kanata and Orleans urban centres, before urban development may proceed. Among other matters, this amendment will define the boundaries of the south urban centre.

02.2.0.0 02( )

(Point #04)
No objection to including additional lands in the Nepean portion of the south urban community as stage 1 lands but objects to the change between the existing plan and the revised plan whereby all lands in the south urban centre are designated urban on schedule A.

In the Official Plan adopted by Regional Council all lands in the south urban centre are designated Urban Area on Schedule A. However, on Schedule B a distinction is made between the Barrhaven area, which is designated General Urban Area, and the remainder which is designated South Urban Centre. Policy 3 of Part 2 requires an amendment to the regional official plan to establish policies for the south urban centre at a similar level of detail to the policies for the Kanata and Orleans urban centres before urban development may proceed. Policy 1 of Part 2 establishes that the south urban centre shall be approximately 3,400 hectares.

02.2.0.0 05( ) (Point #05)
It is questioned whether policy 5 is necessary.

The intent of this policy is to permit an initial phase of the South Urban Centre adjacent to Barrhaven before an amendment to the Regional Official Plan for the entire South Urban Centre has been approved. This flexibility exists in the Official Plan adopted by Regional Council in 1974 and approved by the Ontario Municipal Board and should not be lost.
This intent has been maintained in the revised Official Plan adopted by Regional Council but conditions have been stipulated. The location and size of the initial phase must not adversely affect matters of regional concern or involve Regional expenditure to provide sewers.

03.2.3.0 05( ) (Point #06)
Necessity for policy 5 is questioned.

The purpose of the above-noted policy in Section 3.2.3.1 of the revised Official Plan, as adopted by Regional Council is to formally state Regional Council's intention to permit a Regional Shopping Centre in the Nepean portion of the South Urban Centre.

02.2.0.0 08( ) (Point #07)
Suggest that reference to a 10-year supply of serviced land be deleted wherever it appears in the text.

The Official Plan adopted by Regional Council retains the objective of extending services so that a minimum of a 10-year supply of serviced vacant residential land is available. The supply of serviced residential land needs to be substantially greater than the objective for vacant land in draft approved and registered plans of subdivision (a minimum 2-year supply) to provide for choice of location and competition, market cycles, and longer lead times for extension of trunk sewers.

02.1.6.0 11( ) (Point #08)
The 10-year supply of residential land objective is questioned as being an oversupply

The revised Official Plan adopted by Regional Council contains the objective of maintaining a minimum of 10 years supply of residential land with trunk services, calculated on a Regional basis. This provides for orderly market operation.

02.1.6.0 00( ) (Point #09)
In para 6 Kanata Council agrees that having a detailed servicing sequence in the official plan is not appropriate but nevertheless requests regional planning committee to produce such a sequence. Kanata Council cannot support the proposals until the servicing sequence is produced.

Detailed servicing sequences are approved by Regional Council each year during its consideration of the capital budget forecast.

02.2.0.0 04( ) (Point #10)
The maximum number of households for Kanata should be set at 35,000.

The Official Plan adopted by Regional Council sets the maximum number of households for the Kanata Urban Centre at 35,000.

04.2.3.0 14( )

(Point #11)
Objects to the inclusion of significant wildlife habitats in the criteria that might make general rural area lands unsuitable for development.

The criteria are given as examples and only those which are applicable in a given situation will be used.

02.2.0.0 04( )

(Point #12)
The word "landuse" should be inserted before the word "opportunities".

The wording of this policy in the Official Plan adopted by Regional Council has been amended to "shall provide land use and development policies ...to enable dwelling units and jobs to locate in...".

04.2.3.0 15(a)

(Point #13)
Suggests that the word "or" be added after 15a and before 15b, so that country lot subdivision may be approved where there is an average lot size of 0.8 hectares.

If individual lots are to be smaller than 0.8 ha., they should be associated with a recreational facility to achieve a lower density overall.

04.2.3.0 17( )

(Point #14)
This policy should be modified to include the possibility of approving country lot development on lots smaller than 10 hectares where there is an insufficient number of mature trees or topographic variety if buffering can be provided.

It is the intent that the natural landscape should prevail, not to create artificial looking sites (e.g. a buffer of trees down the side) just for the sake of trying to hide houses. There is no intent that houses have to be hidden, just that they blend well with the natural features on the site.

06.2.6.0 12( )

(Point #15)
Policy should be changed so that area municipalities are not obliged to permit group homes in all areas where residential uses are permitted.

The policy adopted by Council requires that zoning by-laws permit group homes in all areas zoned primarily for residential uses, in order that no one or two municipalities take a disproportionate share of these facilities.

10.2.2.0 01( )

(Point #16)
Clarification is requested on whether the studies carried out for Hazeldean North, Kanata North business park, South March Energy Conserving community, Marchwood Lakeside and Bridlewood would serve as master drainage plans as per policy 1.

The studies already done for these areas will not have to be re-done as a result of the new policies.

11.2.1.0 05( ) (Point #17)
This policy should specify a time-frame and minimum threshold amount of travel to indicate when Tier 1 road improvements would be undertaken.

There is no "tiering" of road improvements in the official plan adopted by Regional Council. Council will determine the priority of improvements to the regional road system in its five-year capital budget forecast in the context of monitoring reports and other indicators of need.

11.4.2.0 19( ) (Point #19)
It is requested that transitway extensions needed for the south urban centre be identified as a third priority.

This has been done in the official plan adopted by Regional Council.

00.0.0.0 00( ) AB (Point #20)
North 1/2 lot 9 and lot 10 conc. 3 Kanata from Second Line road allowance east to hydro easement should be urban.

This has been incorporated in the urban area.

00.0.0.0 00( ) AB (Point #21)
North 1/2 lot 9 and lot 10 conc. 4 Kanata from March Road east to the railway line be urban.

Riddell Village has been incorporated into the urban area.

00.0.0.0 00( ) AB (Point #22)
Lands east of the First Line Road allowance in lots 1, 2 and 3 conc. 2, Kanata and lands east of the floodplain of the Carp River in lot 29 and lot 30 should be urban.

The urban area has been extended to include all of lots 1 and 2 conc. 2 south of Highway 417. North of 417 the boundary remains Terry Fox Drive. Lands east of the Carp River in lots 29 and 30 have been included in the urban area.

00.0.0.0 00( ) A (Point #23)
All land designated agricultural resource area in Kanata except the Walter Baker Park in lots 29 and 30 concession 12 (formerly Township of Goulbourn) should change from agricultural resource to general rural area because the land is marginal for agriculture; there is a high level of land fragmentation; and there is a strong intermix of uses.

The land in the Carp Valley is prime farm land and, although only a small portion of it is in Kanata, the area of contiguous farming stretches into Goulbourn and West Carleton. North of Regional Road 49 the area is approximately 75% class 1, 2 and 3; it is being farmed and is not affected by urban uses. This land is designated Agricultural Resource in the official plan adopted by Regional Council.

<u>Brief #30: Ms. Janet Bradley, Soloway, Wright, et. al. (for John Steenbakkers)</u>

00.0.0.0 00( ) AB (Point #01)
West 1/2 of lot 30 concession 11 formerly Goulbourn now Kanata. There is a 14 hectare parcel and a 11 hectare parcel with frontage on Hazeldean Road, which are separated by a MVCA water retention pond. Land is not farmed.

Request is for either urban designation or a designation which would permit institutional or small business uses. Points made in support of the proposal are that although it is class 1 soil, its value for agriculture is reduced because there is no access to the southerly property. It is too small to be operated as a farm unit. The property only has access to a 4-lane highway.

That part east of the Carp River has been included in the urban area. That part west of the Carp River remains Agricultural Resource. This land has to be considered in the context of all the land between Kanata and Stittsville. Having regard to the need to establish the south urban centre, the transportation facilities potentially available to service the western part of the urban area and the overall supply of vacant urban land, this area is not designated for urban development. As prime farm land which is part of an area of contiguous farming along the Carp Valley which extends into West Carleton, it is designated Agricultural Resource.

Brief #31: Mr. M.J. Bacon, Proctor & Redfern Group (for Tavsham Investors)

00.0.0.0 00( ) AB (Point #01)

Request to include in the urban area land immediately west of the Energy Conserving Community from the Ontario Hydro right-of-way to the Second Line Road between the Klondike Road and the future Terry Fox Drive. Reasons for the request include providing housing variety and choice, providing the community with more appropriate boundaries, meeting desired population levels, maintaining residential land supply, efficient development, limiting disruption to the existing and planned community, accessibility to major roads, transit, secondary employment centres, contribution to the extension of existing services and facilities.

This has been done.

Brief #32: Mr. M.J. Bacon, Proctor & Redfern Group (for Messrs. Davidson et.al.)

00.0.0.0 00( ) AB (Point #01)

Lot 25 concessions 9 and 10 Goulbourn, east east 1/2 lot 24 concession 9 Goulbourn, west 1/2 lot 24 concession 9 Goulbourn. All properties are located immediately south and east of the Village of Stittsville. Request is that these lands be amended to general rural area with the exception of the land subject to Goulbourn's Official Plan Amendment 54 which should be urban area. Points made in support of the request are that it will add to the viability of the redevelopment of the southern portion of Stittsville Main Street. The land cannot be used economically for agriculture. The Ontario Hydro corridor will further fragment the land.

Lots 24 and 25 conc. 9 and lot 25 conc. 10 have been designated General Rural and Stittsville has been expanded to include the land subject to Goulbourn's Official Plan Amendment 54.

Brief #33: Mr. M.J. Bacon, Proctor & Redfern Group (for Messrs. Bradley et.al.)

00.0.0.0 00( ) AB (Point #01)

Lot 22 conc. 9, Goulbourn. They request a special study designation until the Township has carried out an investigation of the secondary

plan for Stittsville.

The designation of the land as General Rural does not prejudice the Township of Goulbourn's secondary plan for Stittsville. If the lands were designated as "special study" this might be understood as a pre-commitment to urban development.

Brief #34: Mr. Alan Rackow, P.Eng.

03.2.3.0 22( ) (Point #01)

Raises the question of whether the traffic impact study required for regional shopping centres should be carried out by the developer's consultant or the region's as is proposed for market surveys.

The Official Plan adopted by Regional Council does not require that consultants for traffic impact studies be retained by the Region. Regional Council is satisfied that traffic impact studies carried out by professional engineers using agreed upon factors and parameters are credible tools that vary little regardless of who the client is.

Brief #35: Ms. Janet Bradley, Soloway, Wright, et. al. (for Arnon Development Corporation)

11.2.4.0 00( ) C2 (Point #01)

This is an objection to regional road widening policies generally but specifically to the land owned by the author of the brief, namely the Campbell Steel lands and land fronting on Besserer, George, Slater and Laurier.

The Planning Act, 1983 specifically provides for road widening policies such as those contained in the official plan adopted by Regional Council. In the central area (i.e. Besserer, George, Slater and Laurier) the policy is directed primarily to the provision of adequate sidewalks by means of an easement. Each new development contributes to the volume of movement; it is reasonable that each contribute to the solution as well.

Brief #36: Ms. Janet Bradley, Soloway, Wright, et. al. (for John Steenbakkers)

00.0.0.0 00( ) AB (Point #01)

West 1/2 of lot 30 conc. 11 formerly Goulbourn now in the City of Kanata. A request that the land be designated urban because it was previously designated for development in the Township of Goulbourn's 1969 official plan. The MVCA water retention pond affects the property. The proposed Outer Ring Road may affect the property. There is not sufficient land designated in the regional official plan for the proposed population. The land is ideal for expanding the west urban community because it is adjacent to Glen Cairn. Servicing and transportation networks are available; MVCA pond is primarily a dry pond. City of Kanata has developed most fully south of Highway 7, so it is logical to expand in this area. Sewer is available to the south of this land and the water mains run to the north. The owner is an experienced developer. The land is not contributing to the agricultural land bank. Land is is well served by roads.

That part east of the Carp River has been included in the urban area. That part west of the Carp River remains Agricultural Resource. This land has to be considered in the context

of all the land between Kanata and Stittsville. Having regard to the need to establish the south urban centre, the transportation facilities potentially available to service the western part of the urban area and the overall supply of vacant urban land (there is sufficient land designated for the proposed population), this area is not designated for urban development. As prime farm land which is part of an area of contiguous farming along the Carp Valley which extends into West Carleton, it is designated Agricultural Resource.

Brief #37: Ms. Janet Bradley, Soloway, Wright, et. al. (for Del Corporation)

00.0.0.0 00( ) AB (Point #01)
Lot 29 conc. 11 formerly Goulbourn (now City of Kanata) and lot 28 conc. 11, Goulbourn. A request that the land be designated urban because it was previously designated for development in the Township of Goulbourn's 1969 official plan. The MVCA water retention pond affects the property. It is primarily a dry pond. The proposed Outer Ring Road may affect the property. There is not sufficient land designated in the regional official plan for the proposed population. The land is ideal for expanding the west urban community because it is adjacent to Glen Cairn. Servicing and transportation networks are available, City of Kanata has developed most fully south of Highway 7, so it is logical to expand in this area. Sewer is available to the south of this land and the the watermains run to the north. The owner is an experienced developer. The land is not contributing to the agricultural land bank. Land is well served by roads.

That part east of the Carp River has been included in the urban area. For the rest of the area, having regard to the need to establish the south urban centre, the transportation facilities potentially available to service the western part of the urban area and overall supply of vacant urban land (there is sufficient land designated for the proposed population), this area is not designated for urban development. It is designated Agricultural Resource Area as prime farm land which is part of an area of contiguous farming along the Carp Valley which extends into West Carleton.

00.0.0.0 00( ) AB (Point #02)
[Seward - spoken] Cheaper, more affordable housing will result if development is permitted on 600 acres in this area subject to conditions on type and price of housing.

Having regard to the need to establish the south urban centre, the transportation facilities potentially available to service the western part of the urban area and the overall supply of vacant urban land, this area is not designated for urban development.

Brief #38: Mr. Peter Martin, M.M. Dillon Ltd. (for Shenkman Corporation)

02.1.2.0 03( ) (Point #01)
Concur that surplus urban land should be designated to ensure an orderly market operation in residential land.

The Official Plan adopted by Regional Council designates urban land beyond the forecast requirements in order to ensure orderly market operation.

02.1.3.0 04( ) (Point #02)
Support three urban centres outside the greenbelt.

The revised Official Plan adopted by Regional Council designates three urban centres outside the greenbelt.

02.2.0.0 02( ) (Point #03)
Support for stage 1 designation in south urban centre.

The Official Plan adopted by Regional Council does not distinguish between Stage 1 and Stage 2 areas in the south urban centre. However, it is intended to extend the trunk sewers first to the Nepean portion and then across the Rideau River to the Gloucester portion.

02.2.0.0 03( ) (Point #04)
Request study on Stage 1, south urban community lands be initiated immediately.

The Official Plan adopted by Regional Council contains no reference to a study for the south urban centre and no longer makes a distinction between Stage 1 and Stage 2 lands. The initiative for planning of the south urban centre now rests with the Cities of Nepean and Gloucester; who have work underway.

02.1.7.0 12( ) (Point #05)
Support for transportation policies supporting the south urban centre.

These policies are contained in the revised Official Plan adopted by Regional Council, except that extension of the transitway to the south urban centre is now third rather than second priority.

10.1.2.0 01( ) (Point #06)
The staff estimate of infrastructure costs to service the Shenkman lands is at least $40 million too high.

The costs of providing sewer/water services to meet Council's land supply objectives regardless of locations are reviewed annually when considering the five-year capital program. Actual net financing requirements in the capital budget authority for the construction of collector sewers and watermains for the South Urban Centre would be considered during this annual review. Estimates prepared are based on information available to staff.

Brief #39: Mr. Donald Dunn, Ontario Ministry of Agriculture and Food

01.7.2.0 00( ) (Point #01)
Would like a statement to be included to say that Council will "have regard to matters of provincial interest and policy statements as prescribed by the Planning Act".

A statement has not been added to Section 1.7.2 of the revised official plan adopted by Regional Council. However, this matter is dealt with in Section 1.1 as follows:
"Like all other municipalities in Ontario, the Region plans within the parameters established by the Planning Act, 1983. Among other things, this means that, in exercising its planning authority, Council will have regard to policy statements on matters of provincial interest under sub-section 3(1) of the Planning Act, 1983."

04.2.3.0 00( )	(Point #02) Policy should be included to ensure compliance with the Minimum Separation Distance requirements of the Agricultural Code of Practice particularly for country lot development. *Policy 5 in Section 4.2.1 requires Council to have regard to the Agricultural Code of Practice for all development in the rural area.*
04.2.4.0 00( )	(Point #03) The criteria for infilling should be more precise to give guidance to local municipalities e.g. may be permitted when residences are no more than 100 metres apart. *Local municipalities may establish additional criteria but Regional interests can be satisfied without going into more detail.*
05.1.2.0 01( )	(Point #04) The word, "viable", should be replaced with the word "suitable". *This has been done.*
05.1.3.1 01( ) A	(Point #05) Concern is expressed that only some class 4 lands have been included in the agricultural resource designation. Clarification of the status of production of class 4 land is requested. *Class 4 land that showed evidence of being actively farmed was included in the Agricultural Resource Area designation, where it was contiguous with class 1, 2 or 3 land.*
05.1.3.1 01(d)	(Point #06) Clarification on what constitutes "open air recreation uses" is requested. *"Open air recreation" may include any outdoor recreation activity.*
05.1.3.2 03(a)	(Point #07) Support for general approach, strong concerns about permitting farm help lots without more specific criteria in the Regional Official Plan. *Criteria have been added to limit the severances to full time farm help.*
05.1.3.2 03(b)	(Point #08) A definition should be provided for farm consolidation to indicate whether this would apply to abutting and/or non-abutting farm parcels. *It is intended that a severance be permissible whether or not the consolidated parcels are abutting.*
05.1.3.2 03(c)	(Point #09) Clarification on what boundary adjustments between farms means, is requested. *"Boundary adjustments" is intended to refer a severance that changes the boundary between two abutting farms. It does not create a building lot.*

05.1.3.2 04( ) (Point #10)
Support for 20-year ownership of land before a retirement lot might be permitted. Suggests other criteria also be added such as the farmer must be retiring from active working life or selling the farm.

A requirement has been added that a retirement severance is granted only at the time the farmer is retiring. A farmer shall have worked on a farm in Ontario for at least 20 years.

05.1.3.2 03(d) (Point #11)
Reference to "economic viability" is not in keeping with the Foodland Guidelines. Additional list of criteria should be incorporated in the official plan.

The criterion has been changed from "economically viable" to "suitable".

05.1.3.3 06( ) (Points #12 to #14)
07 This section is not supported.
08

As OMAF supported almost identical policies in the West Carleton official plan it is not clear why they oppose such policies in the Regional Official Plan.

05.1.3.4 09( ) (Point #15)
This section (Agricultural Advisory Committee) is supported.

This section has been deleted.

05.2.0.0 00( ) (Point #16)
It is suggested that the policies which permit wayside pits and quarries in agricultural resource areas, provided they are rehabilitated to agriculture, should be cross-referenced in the mineral resource area section.

The Mineral Resource section relates only to lands designated Mineral Resource and not to policies for Agricultural Resource Areas.

00.0.0.0 00( ) A (Point #17)
Additional comments will be forthcoming on Schedule A.

These have not yet arrived.

<u>Brief #40: Mr. Douglas Kelly, Soloway, Wright et.al. (for Ivanhoe Inc.)</u>

03.4.3.0 01(a) B (Point #01)
Elmvale Shopping Centre would like to be able to construct a small office tower of between 125,000 and 150,000 sq. ft. G.L.A. They would request confirmation that this is permitted by the proposed designation.

Existing employment levels at Elmvale Shopping Centre and adjacent properties would permit the proposed office construction without exceeding the limit of 2,000 jobs for each discrete cluster of non-residential uses in a General Urban Area designation.

03.1.3.3 00( ) B (Point #02)
Fairlawn Plaza would like to expand in the future. Therefore supports secondary employment designation.

Fairlawn Plaza is a Community Shopping Centre, defined in Section 3.2.3.2 of the Region's re-

vised Official Plan as a shopping centre located outside the central area having between 10,000 sq. m. and 35,000 sq. m. of gross leasable area. In this context Fairlawn may expand up to 35,000 sq. m. without amendment to the Region's revised Official Plan, although the City of Ottawa may establish lower limits in its zoning by-law. In the revised Official Plan adopted by Regional Council Secondary Employment Centre designations are no longer shown on Schedule B. Instead the City of Ottawa and other local municipalities may designate Secondary Employment Centres in their respective Official Plans provided that they meet the criteria established in the Region's Official Plan.

03.2.3.1 03( ) (Point #03)
Are against community associations' position that Carlingwood and Fairlawn should be combined for the purposes of policy 3.

Carlingwood and Fairlawn are not combined in the official plan adopted by Regional Council.

Brief #41: Mr. Alan Cohen, Soloway, Wright et.al. (for Trilea Centres Inc.)

03.2.3.1 03( ) (Point #01)
Concern that Carlingwood Shopping Centre will not be able to expand beyond its current size.

The Official Plan adopted by Regional Council does not establish a gross leasable area ceiling for Carlingwood Shopping Centre. This matter is under study by the City of Ottawa.

03.2.3.1 02( ) (Point #02)
Concern that regional staff will not give sufficient priority to undertaking market studies.

The revised Official Plan adopted by Regional Council contains a policy that requires a region-wide retail study to be conducted for the Region every five years. (Policy 2, Section 3.2.3.1).

03.2.3.1 03( ) (Point #03)
The proposed Regional Official Plan would give Carlingwood an inferior position relative to other Regional Shopping Centres.

A permitted gross leasable area (GLA) is not established for Carlingwood Shopping Centre in the Official Plan adopted by Council. The City of Ottawa is doing a zoning review. Trilea Centres Inc. has agreed not to submit any site plan proposal for a period of eighteen months while the City completes its study. When study results are available, Regional Council will establish a limit for Carlingwood.

03.2.3.1 03( ) (Point #04)
[Janet Bradley - spoken] Market studies will be done at the whim of the planning department.

The revised Official Plan adopted by Regional Council contains a policy that requires a region-wide retail study to be conducted for the Region every five years. (Policy 2, Section 3.2.3.1).

03.2.3.1 03( ) (Point #05)
[Janet Bradley - spoken] We urge that the Carlingwood and Fairlawn shopping centres not be combined for the purposes of this policy.

The revised Official Plan adopted by Regional Council does not combine Carlingwood Shopping Centre and Fairlawn Plaza.

Brief #42: Mr. Seymour Mender, Kimmel, Victor & Ages (for Tanglewood Ottawa Ltd.)

00.0.0.0 00( ) AB (Point #01)
South 1/2 lot 22, conc. 5, Gloucester. Supports the position of the City of Gloucester for a development in the Leitrim area.

In the revised official plan adopted by Regional Council, an urban area of approximately 500 ha. is designated in the vicinity of Leitrim. The south 1/2 lot 22, conc. 5 is not however, included in the urban area designation; it is designated General Rural Area and Mineral Resource Area.

00.0.0.0 00( ) AB (Point #02)
Would like to be included in the village of Leitrim in order to develop high technology services, a 50-room motel, a restaurant, conference hall, housing development complimentary industry, offices, and a retail plaza that would include a bank, legal and medical offices, pharmacy and retail stores.

This land has not been included in the Leitrim urban area; it is designated General Rural Area and Mineral Resource Area.

Brief #43: Mr. Merrill Cutts, City of Gloucester

00.0.0.0 00( ) B (Point #01)
Industrial areas in the vicinity of Albion Road, Leitrim Road, and Bank Street, should be designated Extensive Employment Area and be eligible for extension of water and sewer services.

In the official plan adopted by Regional Council, an urban area of approximately 500 ha. has been designated in the vicinity of Leitrim. About half of this urban area has been designated Extensive Employment Area. As urban area, it is eligible for the extension of water and sewer services; however, in Policy 9 of Part 2, Council has stated that it shall not incur costs for the provision of infrastructure relating to development in Leitrim.

00.0.0.0 00( ) B (Point #02)
The airport should be designated an extensive employment area.

The airport has been designated Greenbelt Reserve (Ottawa International Airport and CFB Uplands) on Schedule A. Policy 4 of Section 3.5.3 permits the airport to be used for civilian and military airport purposes and for purposes that would otherwise be allowed in Extensive Employment Areas.

00.0.0.0 00( ) AB (Point #03)
Remaining land in the Leitrim area should be designated as ""potential urban area"" with policies to permit conversion to urban uses only if land reserves are depleted sufficiently in other urban areas and when the majority of lands within the Gloucester part of the south urban centre have been developed.

If the lands were designated "potential urban area" this might be understood as a precommit-

ment to urban development. Until studies are done as part of the next review of the regional official plan it cannot be presumed that Leitrim will be the next area for major urban growth.

03.1.3.2 04(a) (Point #04)
Concern is expressed that 10,000 jobs may not be accommodated in the Orleans Town Centre, and that the Region delete references to specific job totals relating to each employment area.

The Region's revised Official Plan as adopted by Council articulates an interest in the number and distribution of jobs in the Region. The Region sets job targets for employment areas/centres and the area municipalities implement these targets through the establishment and maintenance of development density provisions and boundaries for employment centres in their respective Official Plans and zoning by-laws. The Region's job targets targets are expressed as minima and maxima (e.g. at least 5,000 jobs) leaving considerable flexibility for local planning. The word "approximately" has also been added.
The Primary Employment Centre designation at the Orleans Town Centre on Schedule B of the Region's revised Official Plan reflects anticipated employment levels based on the City of Gloucester's and the Township of Cumberland's respective zoning by-law provisions. While the target of 10,000 jobs for the Orleans Town Centre is not expected to be achieved by 2001, Regional Council is satisfied that given the development potential as well as the existing/planned transportation and servicing infrastructure in the vicinity of the Orleans Town Centre, the Primary Employment Centre designation is warranted.

03.2.3.3 08( )
09 (Points #05 & #06)
The Region should delete policies dealing with neighbourhood shopping centres.

The Region's revised Official Plan retains the policies contained in Section 3.2.3.3 to complete the overall framework of Section 3.2 Shopping Facilities which deals with the hierarchy of Regional, Community and Neighbourhood Shopping Centres.

04.2.3.0 14( ) (Point #07)
Policy should be amended to require that local municipalities identify in their official plans those areas that are suitable for country lot development, but not the number of country lots.

Reference has been removed to local official plans having to identify the number of country lots to be permitted.

05.1.3.3 08( ) (Point #08)
Policy 8 should be deleted.

The official plan adopted by Regional Council permits lot sizes of 2 hectares or more.

05.1.3.3 06( ) (Point #09)
The criteria in policy 6 should be amended to say that a) the proposed lot complies with the agricultural code of practice and minimum separation distance;
b) there is sufficient quality and quantity of

potable water on site and that the site can accommodate a private sewage disposal system;
c) the proposed lot not interfere with the adjacent or nearby farming operations;
d) lots created under this clause be limited to no more than one lot per farm operation;
e) the lot size be no less than 0.8 hectares, however, a larger lot size will be encouraged in order to protect the rural character of the area.

a) Reference to the Agricultural Code Practice has been made in new policy 7;
b) Reference to water quality is covered by policy 8.
c) Avoidance of interference with farming operations is covered by policies 6d) and 7.
d) Providing all the criteria are satisfied there is no need to set a limit of one lot per farm.
e) A minimum lot size of 2 hectares was selected by Regional Council.

10.1.2.0 05( )

(Point #10)
The allocation for Leitrim and South Gloucester should be lumped together and that Gloucester be permitted to determine where the units are to be allocated through its official plan policies.

The capacity now refers only to South Gloucester as Leitrim has been designated an urban area.

10.1.2.0 07(b)

(Point #11)
This policy should be amended to incorporate the Region as co-signer to the required agreements for private communal sewage systems.

The Region requires the developer and local municipality to enter into an agreement. This is seen as sufficient guarantee and there is no apparent necessity for the Region itself to be a co-signatory.

00.0.0.0 00( ) C1

(Point #12)
Innes Road should be shown on Schedule C1 as an existing regional road.

In the official plan adopted by Regional Council, Innes Road is shown on Schedule C1 as an existing regional road, except for the portion through Blackburn Hamlet which will become a local road when the Blackburn Hamlet Bypass is built.

00.0.0.0 00( ) C1

(Point #13)
Blackburn Hamlet bypass should turn northward to link with Innes because: 1) provision has already been made for Innes to be a six-lane arterial; 2) development along Innes Road has incorporated various access restrictions in anticipation of increased traffic; 3) plans for the Orleans south industrial park have been approved; 4) there is no supporting evidence for the particular location shown on the plan.

Schedule C1 of the official plan adopted by Regional Council includes both a Blackburn Hamlet Bypass extension and a link from the east end of the bypass to Innes Road. Both roads are required to provide efficient service to the development in the East Urban Centre. The bypass will be constructed first and will rejoin Innes Road at the western edge of Orleans. Innes Road through the urban centre

will require upgrading eventually to urban standards as a four-lane facility. Construction of the bypass extension will follow at a later date. The location of proposed regional roads on Schedule C1 is approximate only. Studies will now be undertaken to determine location and property requirements for the bypass extension.

00.0.0.0 00( ) C1 (Point #14)
Bearbrook Road should be identified as an existing regional road on Schedule C1.

Schedule C1 shows the future regional road system. After the completion of the Blackburn Hamlet Bypass, Innes Road within Blackburn Hamlet will cease to be a regional road. Consequently, Bearbrook Road will no longer meet the criteria for regional roads and will also cease to be a regional road. These decisions will be subject to Regional Council approval in the context of a regional road reclassification study at the time.

00.0.0.0 00( ) C1 (Point #15)
The City supports Innes/Walkley/Blair connection shown on Schedule C1.

The Innes/Walkley/Blair connection is shown on Schedule C1 of the official plan adopted by Regional Council.

00.0.0.0 00( ) C1 (Point #17)
The existing Innes Road should be a Tier 1 road improvement, not the proposed new road.

The official plan adopted by Regional Council no longer contains a "tiering" of road improvements.

01.7.1.0 00( ) (Point #18)
Should be reworded to read, "some policies are implemented in part through approval of official plans and appeal of zoning by-laws adopted or passed by area municipalities."

This rewording is not included in the revised official plan adopted by Regional Council. The proposed rewording would have added reference to the processes of approval and appeal. However, implementation of the regional official plan is achieved through local official plans and zoning by-laws, which under the Planning Act, 1983 must conform to the regional official plan, not through the processes which lead to approval.

02.1.3.0 00( ) (Point #19)
In paragraph 6, reference is made to "The road network developed in a radial pattern". Clarification of what is meant by this would be appreciated.

The road pattern generally developed running east, west and south from the central area (areas of earliest settlement). While to describe this as a "radial pattern" is not

entirely accurate, it is considered adequate for a descriptive statement with no policy implications.

03.1.3.2 05( )

(Point #20)
The requirement to incorporate the number of jobs in local official plans is questioned.

The Region's revised Official Plan as adopted by Council articulates an interest in the number and distribution of jobs in the Region. The Region sets job targets for employment areas/ centres and the area municipalities implement these targets through the establishment and maintenance of development density provisions and boundaries for employment centres in their respective Official Plans and zoning by-laws. The Region's job targets are expressed as minima and maxima (e.g. at least 5,000 jobs) leaving considerable flexibility for local planning. The word "approximately" has also been added.

03.1.3.3 00( ) B

(Point #21)
There appears to be a need to include a secondary employment centre at Cyrville Road and Highway 417.

Secondary Employment Centre designations are no longer shown on Schedule B. The Official Plan adopted by Council permits local municipalities to designate Secondary Employment Centres in their respective Official Plans provided that they meet the criteria established in the Region's Official Plan.

03.4.3.0 00( )

(Point #22)
Rewording to suggest "in terms of planning...the approval of plans of subdivision and comments on zoning and site plans" should be amended to read "the approval of plans of subdivisions and comments provided on zoning and site plans".

This change was incorporated in the revised official plan adopted by Regional Council.

03.4.3.0 01(a)

(Point #23)
Clarification of what is meant by an aggregation of non-residential uses up to 2,000 jobs is requested.

In the revised official plan adopted by Regional Council, the wording has been changed to "discrete clusters of contiguous non-residential uses". This wording makes it clearer that there is no intent to set a limit on the number of such aggregations/discrete clusters in areas designated General Urban Area (either by area municipality, urban centre or any other basis).

04.2.5.0 19( )

(Point #25)
A rephrasing is suggested "multiple unit development of more than five units may be permitted in villages and serviced villages if the local official plan contains policies concerning the type, amount and location of multiple unit development and the requirements of policy 7 in section 10.1 concerning private communal systems are met".

Agree. This has been reworded.

05.1.3.2 04( )

(Point #26)
Would like to see a lesser time with a stronger definition of what working on the farm entails to give some flexibility.

The twenty year period for eligibility for a retirement severance has been maintained as a

means of ensuring that they go only to those who have given a long commitment to farming.

05.2.7.0 03( ) (Point #27)
There is no rationale for not permitting residential uses on rehabilitated pit sites.

Housing on rehabilitated pit sites in Mineral Resource Areas may sterilize the surrounding deposit.

05.2.7.0 06( ) (Point #28)
Reference to the Ministry of Natural Resources should be included in this paragraph.

This has been done.

06.2.6.0 12( ) (Point #29)
Should be amended to permit group homes to be permitted in all areas zoned primarily for residential uses.

The policy was revised to incorporate this suggestion. It now reads, in part, "in all areas where primarily residential uses are permitted".

11.4.1.0 00( ) (Point #30)
The plan should provide for park and ride and kiss and ride facilities.

This has been done in Section 11.4.4 of the official plan adopted by Regional Council.

00.0.0.0 00( ) AB (Point #31)
Boundaries of the urban area are not consistent on each schedule.

The urban/rural distinctions on Schedules C and D are related to the extent of urban and rural regional roads and are not intended to relate to the geographic extent of the Urban Policy Area on Schedules A and B.

00.0.0.0 00( ) E (Point #32)
Transitway stations should be identified on Schedule E.

The official plan adopted by Regional Council does not identify transitway stations on Schedule E. The location of transitway stations is not decided until design studies are done, so the location of future stations is uncertain. Designation on Schedule E would limit flexibility.

01.3.0.0 00( ) (Point #33)
[David O'Brien - spoken] Concern that the population projections and absorption rates are understated. The city recognizes the financial constraints in the short and medium term - but the official plan should take a longer view.

Based on current projections of population and urban land requirements, the amount of designated urban land in the revised official plan adopted by Regional Council exceeds the forecast of developed urban land in 2011, i.e. the official plan does take a longer view. If the projections prove to be understated, additional urban land may be designated during the

quinquennial review of the official plan required by the Planning Act, 1983 or at any time by amendment to the Plan.

01.3.0.0 00( ) (Point #34)
[David O'Brien - spoken] If the Gloucester position on the South Urban Centre and Leitrim is incorporated in the ROP, Gloucester will withdraw the its o.p. amendments 9 and 47.

The official plan adopted by Regional Council makes no distinction between Stage 1 and Stage 2 areas in the South Urban Centre and provides for an urban area of approximately 500 hectares in the vicinity of Leitrim. The question of expansion to the boundaries of the Orleans urban centre including the lands affected by Amendments 9 and 47 to Gloucester's official plan is still under review as a result of a proposal by the Township of Cumberland.

Brief #44: Mr. Donald C. Johnston, Kingdon Holdings Limited

00.0.0.0 00( ) A (Point #01)
Lots 13 and 14, concession 7, Fitzroy Ward, West Carleton. It is proposed to be designated agricultural resource and he would like it designated general rural area.

The small size of this area within a large agricultural area means it would qualify as a "poor pocket" where 2 ha. severances could be permitted. It is too small to warrant a General Rural designation.

00.0.0.0 00( ) A (Point #02)
There was a draft plan of subdivision on the property which was allowed to lapse and the owner has spent several thousand dollars on it in drilling test wells, clearing and grubbing streets.

The small size of this area within a large agricultural area means it would qualify as a "poor pocket" where 2 ha. severances could be permitted. It is too small to warrant a General Rural designation.

Brief #45: Mr. John O'Connor, Tartan Group Inc.

00.0.0.0 00( ) AB (Points #01 to #03)
We own part of lots 18 and 19, conc. 4, Rideau Front, City of Gloucester. Land is 320 acres acres between Bank Street and Albion Road. There is very little land available for immediate development in the southern portion of the Region. This land can be brought on-stream with a relatively small front end expenditure. The Leitrim area should be included in the Regional Official Plan as an immediate growth area..

This land is included in the Leitrim urban area in the official plan adopted by Regional Council. The official plan also states that Council shall not incur costs for infrastructure relating to development in Leitrim (policy 9, Part 2).

Brief #46: Mr. Douglas Kelly, Soloway, Wright et.al. (for Campeau Corporation)

03.2.3.1 02( ) (Point #01)
The owner of the South Keys shopping centre site wishes to construct a shopping centre of 70,000 square metres immediately in one phase rather than the previous plan of 2 phases. Therefore either the policy requiring region-wide retail

studies prepared for the Region be deleted or South Keys should be permitted to expand to 70,000 sq. m. immediately by changing the table in Policy 3.

The Official Plan adopted by Regional Council establishes a gross leasable area ceiling of 70,000 sq. m. for South Keys shopping centre.

03.2.3.1 02( ) (Point #02)
South Keys shopping centre will not affect Orleans or Kanata town centres.

The revised Official Plan adopted by Regional Council establishes a gross leasable area ceiling of 70,000 sq.m. for South Keys shopping centre.

Brief #47: Mr. Brian Arbuckle

00.0.0.0 00( ) A (Point #01)
Lot 21, concession 4 and lot 21, concession 3, Township of Goulbourn. They would like the designation to be general rural area rather than agricultural area. The quality of the soil is no different from lot 20, concessions 3 and 4 which has been designated "general rural". Farming is not economically possible on this area. It is a logical expansion to the future growth of Richmond.

This has been changed to General Rural.

Brief #48: Mr. Vern Rampton et.al., Landowners of Lots 10-15, Con. I, Huntley

00.0.0.0 00( ) A (Points #01-#06)
Lots 10-15, concession I, Huntley Ward, Township of West Carleton. The owners are asking that the land be designated general rural area, rather than agricultural resource area. Much of the area is underlain by bedrock, gravel, swampy areas and steep slopes. Over half the area is treed. There are many small fields which are either idle or used for forage. There are numerous residences located in the area. A similar area across the old Ottawa Road (Old Carp Road?) is being utilized mainly as country estate residential.

This has been changed to General Rural.

Brief #49: Mr. J.L. Ferguson, Ontario Hydro

01.7.2.0 00( ) (Point #01)
Requests that a specific policy be included in the official plan which permits electric power facilities in all land use designations without an amendment.

Section 61 of the Planning Act, 1983 specifies the application of the act to Ontario Hydro. It is neither necessary nor desirable to repeat these provisions in the official plan.

Brief #50: Ms. Carole Tolley, Ontario Ministry of Housing

06.2.1.0 02( ) (Point #01)
Council is eligible to apply for financial assistance to prepare a regional housing statement once every three years, rather than every five years.

This information has been noted.

Brief #51: Mr. W.T. Leathem, City of Nepean

00.0.0.0 00( ) (Point #01)
[Superseded by brief #73]

Brief #52: Mr. Bob Avery & Mrs. Ghislaine Brunet

00.0.0.0 00( ) A (Point #01)
Lot 12, 13, & 14, Concession II, and part lot 12, Concession III, Township of Cumberland. Copy of a letter to the Ontario Municipal Board about a hearing into a proposed local official plan amendment.

In the revised official plan adopted by Regional Council the Canaan Hill area has been changed to Mineral Resource Area, which reflects the designation in the Cumberland Official Plan, which has been approved by the Ontario Municipal Board.
Cumberland Township has so designated the Canaan Hill area and this designation stands approved. The Regional Plan should ensure that there is sufficient land designated to satisfy the

Brief #53: Mr. James Kearns, City of Vanier

08.3.3.0 03( ) (Point #01)
It is not clear whether the permitted uses are sufficiently comprehensive to reflect the City's plans for Cummings Island.

This cannot be answered until the specific uses are known.

03.1.3.3 08( ) (Point #02)
The secondary employment centre designation does not provide adequately for the potential development of Vanier's commercial core area.

In the revised Official Plan adopted by Regional Council a Primary Employment Centre is designated on Schedule B for Vanier's commercial core area.

03.1.3.3 08( ) (Point #03)
This designation should also permit high density residential uses.

High density residential development is permitted in Secondary Employment Centres designated in local official plans provided that the opportunity to accommodate employment is not reduced below the levels established for Secondary Employment Centres in the Region's Official Plan.

00.0.0.0 00( ) C1 (Point #04)
Support for the Vanier Parkway connection with MacDonald Cartier Bridge provided appropriate noise attentuation measures are taken and the street is not designated a truck route.

The Vanier Parkway connection to the MacDonald Cartier bridge is included in the official plan adopted by Regional Council. The project will be subject to the requirements of the Environmental Assessment Act which places heavy emphasis on mitigation of impacts on the environment (social and natural). The extension will be designed as a parkway with landscaping and earth berming to protect from noise and visual intrusions.
Being a regional road linking the MacDonald-Cartier bridge to the Queensway, the Vanier Parkway should be available for all traffic, including trucks. However Council has not made a decision on this issue.

07.2.1.0 06( ) (Points #05 to #10)
Support the policy of including in municipal zoning by-laws a requirement for a fill and construction permit for development in a flood plain.

This approach has been maintained although there has been a minor rewording.

10.2.2.0 01( ) (Point #12)
Comprehensive storm water management policies are a desirable objective, but having master drainage plans in areas which are already developed is questionable (policies 1-8).

Policy 2 does not require master drainage plans for areas already developed.

Brief #54: Mr. Jonathon Freedman, Equity Management International Limited (for J. Freedman In Trust)

02.2.0.0 02( ) AB (Point #01)
Support for land in south urban community in Nepean.

The Official Plan adopted by Regional Council designates a south urban centre in Nepean and Gloucester.

Brief #55: Mr. J.R. Bell, W.J. Bell & Son Construction Ltd.

00.0.0.0 00( ) AB (Point #01)
Boundary in the village of Stittsville should be extended southerly in accordance with Goulbourn's Official Plan Amendment 54.

This has been done.

04.2.3.0 16( ) (Point #02)
Add the word, "planned", between the words, "continued" and "expansion".

Whether or not expansion has currently been provided for in an official plan, it may need to be at some point in time. The possibility of continued village expansion beyond the time horizon in the current village plan should not be precluded.

Brief #56: Mr. Ralph Spratt

05.1.3.2 03( ) (Point #01)
Objects to restrictions on farm severances.

Having regard to the long term effect uncontrolled severances would have On Agricultural Resource Areas there needs to be policies to limit their creation.

Brief #57: Mr. O. Kremers, Environment Canada Parks

01.2.0.0 02( ) (Points #01 to 05)
04 Support goals 2, 4, 5, 6 and 7.
05
06 *These goals are included without any revision in*
07 *the official plan adopted by Regional Council.*

08.3.1.0 01( ) (Points #06 to #13)
02 Support the River Corridors policies.
03
04 *This section has not been changed.*
05
06
07
08

02.2.0.0 03( ) (Point #14)
Request that in the planning study for the south urban centre special recognition be given to the unique character of the canal and the limited capacity of the Rideau environment to assimilate the effects of human activities. Concerns relate to water quality, water surface recreation, open space, narrow channels and the wetlands.

The Official Plan adopted by Regional Council contains no direct reference to a study for the south urban centre, although additional planning is required. Parks Canada will have to deal directly with the Cities of Nepean and Gloucester.

Brief #58: Mr. Anthony J. Chinery, Ottawa Pedestrian Citizens Committee

02.1.7.0 12( ) (Point #01)
Suggests amending the objective as follows "to provide an integrated transportation system composed of complementary pedestrian, bicycle, public transit and road systems which supports and meets the needs of the desired development pattern."

This objective in the Official Plan adopted by Regional Council refers only to public transit and road system. These are the regional responsibilities in the RMOC Act. Pedestrian systems (sidewalks) are an area municipality responsibility.

02.2.0.0 03(f) (Point #02)
Suggest amendment as follows "the provision of sufficient public open space in the urban centre particularly along the rivers and of continuous pedestrian and bicycle paths including a link through the greenbelt."

The policy referred to in this comment, which listed matters to be determined in a joint planning study for the south urban centre, is not included in the Official Plan adopted by Regional Council.

03.1.3.2 06( ) (Points #03 & #04)
07 Support policies 6 and 7.

These policies are maintained in the Official Plan adopted by Regional Council.

03.1.3.3 10( ) (Points #05 & 06)
11 Support policies 10 and 11.

These policies are maintained in the Official Plan adopted by Regional Council.

03.2.3.2 07( ) (Point #07)
Suggest adding "e) safe and convenient pedestrian access is provided."

An additional criterion on pedestrian access has not been added to Section 3.2.3.2 in the Official Plan adopted by Regional Council. The criteria in policy 7 relate to the choice of sites for Community Shopping Centres. Pedestrian access is a design consideration once the site has been selected.

03.3.0.0 02( ) (Point #08)
Suggest adding "e) safe and convenient pedestrian access."

This suggested criterion was not added to policy 2 of Section 3.3 in the official plan adopted by Regional Council. This policy lists criteria to be considered in the choice of a location for a major community facility. Once this choice is made, safe and convenient pedestrian access can be ensured by the area municipality through site plan control.

03.4.2.0 01(a) (Point #09)
Support, and would add "and convenient pedestrian access to all such non-residential uses".

This proposed addition was not included in the official plan adopted by Regional Council, however the intent is covered by part b) of the objective, "safe and convenient access by vehicles, transit, bicycles and pedestrians".

03.4.3.0 03(c) (Point #10)
Support.

The policy on safe and convenient pedestrian and bicycle travel is included without change in the revised official plan adopted by Regional Council.

03.4.3.0 08( ) (Point #11)
Support.

The revised official plan adopted by Regional Council continues to indicate that the Region will provide comments to area municipalities on pedestrian circulation when site applications are circulated for development near transitway stations.

03.5.3.0 02(c) (Point #12)
Recommend that this be amended as follows "continuity of major bicycle corridors and pedestrian paths".

Section 3.5.3 of the revised Official Plan adopted by Regional Council continues to make reference only to bicycle corridors. The Official Plan contains a plan for Major Bicycle Corridors (Schedule F); there is no schedule of pedestrian paths.

08.4.0.0 00( ) (Point #13)
It is recommended that the scenic routes be developed as pedestrian routes wherever possible not solely as vehicle routes as the current wording implies.

In the urban area this is the case but it is not practical for the rural area.

11.2.2.0 00( ) (Point #14)
It is recommended that this section be expanded to include reference to consideration for pedestrian safety and convenience.

Reference to pedestrian safety and convenience has not been added to this section of the official plan adopted by Regional Council.

11.1.0.0 01( ) (Point #15)
"To provide an integrated transportation system made up of complementary public transit, pedestrian, bicycle, and road systems which supports and meets the needs of the desired development pattern".

Objective 1 in Part 11 of the official plan adopted by Regional Council continues to refer only to "complementary public transit and road systems". These are the legislated responsibilities of Ottawa-Carleton.

11.1.0.0 02( ) (Point #16)
Recommended it be amended as follows "to provide a safe convenient and efficient transportation system which provides a high level of road, public transit, pedestrian and bicycle accessibility to major centres of activity throughout Ottawa-Carleton".

The objective in the official plan adopted by Regional Council refers only to "road and public transit accessibility". These are the legislated responsibilities of Ottawa-Carleton.

11.4.1.0 15(b) (Points #17 & #18)
15(c) Support policies 15 b) and 15 c).

These policies are retained in the official plan adopted by Regional Council.

11.4.2.0 20( ) (Point #19)
Recommend it be amended as follows "Council shall ensure that at stations along the transitway, high levels of transit ridership are promoted through appropriate station design, adequate provision for pedestrian access and an appropriate arrangement and intensity of development".

This policy has been reworded in the official plan adopted by Regional Council primarily in response to a comment from the City of Ottawa. The verb was changed from ensure to "promote" and there is more specificity about the arrangement of development. There is no reference to appropriate station design.

Brief #59: Mr. Ken Hubert

10.1.2.0 10( ) (Point #02)
This policy should be deleted as it will add additional costs for subdivisions larger than 35 lots.

The policy has been changed first to increase 35 lots to 40, secondly to make it clear that this limit only applies to registration of lots. Draft approved plans may exceed 40 lots.

10.1.2.0 10( ) (Point #02)
Policy 8 makes policy 10 redundant.

As policy 9 (formerly policy 8) has been reworded to make reference to draft approvals, it is no longer regarded as duplicating policy 11 (formerly policy 10).

Brief #60: Mr. James Pfeifer, Environment Blackburn

00.0.0.0 00( ) C1 (Point #01)
Opposes the "tight" Blackburn Hamlet by-pass would prefer to see an alignment using Fourth Line Road and the abandoned CPR Railway track.

Council has adopted the "tight" alignment for the Blackburn Hamlet Bypass. This alignment has also been agreed to by the National Capital Commission (the prime landowner) and the City of Gloucester.

Brief #61: Mr. Wayne Robinson, Township of Osgoode

00.0.0.0 00( ) (Point #01)
Township is unable to comply with deadline for receipt of comments.

Brief #62: Mr. W.C. Stevens, Ontario Ministry of the Environment Southeast Region

01.0.0.0 00( ) (Point #01)
No objections to Part 1.

Part 1 of the revised official plan adopted by Regional Council is little changed from the May 1987 draft.

02.0.0.0 00( ) (Point #02)
No objections to Part 2.

Part 2 in the Official Plan adopted by Regional Council is largely unchanged from the May 1987 draft version. Several policies have been modified, however. There is no distinction between Stage 1 and Stage 2 lands in the South Urban Centre and the maximum number of dwelling units permitted in Kanata has been increased from 30,000 to 35,000; in Orleans and the South Urban Centre from 30,000 to 33,000 and in Stittsville from 4,000 to 6,000. The job maxima were increased correspondingly.

03.0.0.0 00( ) (Point #03)
No objections to Part 3.

Part 3 of the Region's revised Official Plan remains substantially unchanged from the May 1987 draft version.

06.0.0.0 00( ) (Point #04)
No objections to Part 6.

Regional Council adopted staff recommendations in Part 6 with no significant changes.

08.0.0.0 00( ) (Point #05)
No objections to Part 8.

This section has not been changed.

09.0.0.0 00( ) (Point #06)
No objections to Part 9.

This section remains almost unchanged.

11.0.0.0 00( ) (Point #07)
No objections to Part 11.

The only major change to Part 11 between the May 1987 draft and the official plan adopted by Regional Council is that there is no "tiering" of road improvements in the adopted Plan.

04.1.0.0 01( ) (Point #08)
02 Concurs with and supports all four objectives.
03
04 *These are incorporated in the Plan.*

04.1.0.0 00( ) (Point #09)
Support statement that private wells and septic tanks must not adversely affect quality and quantity of ground and surface water. Would like the Region to incorporate the concept of "reasonable use" into groundwater management. This would require hydrogeologic studies to identify the limit on the discharge of contaminants from one property so as not

to affect the present or potential reasonable use of adjacent properties.

This is one of the factors to be considered in the private services studies required by this Plan.

04.2.2.0 10( ) (Point #10)
The term hydrogeology study is a colloquialism. It should be defined to include a private services development study including terrain analysis.

Agree. The text now makes reference to "private services studies".

04.2.2.0 10(b) (Point #11)
The policy of requiring proof of sufficient quantity and quality of water is strongly supported and it is recommended that water quality from wells should be as good or better than the water quality parameters contained in the MOE Provincial Drinking Water Objectives. MOE does not have minimum quantity requirements. However, a minimum of 14 litres per minute is usually accepted by mortgage companies.

Reference to Provincial Drinking Water Objectives has been included in the text. Guidelines for private services studies are being prepared outside of the Plan.

04.2.3.0 12( ) (Point #12)
Agree with 0.8 hectare minimum lot size.

This is incorporated in the Plan.

04.2.3.0 15( ) (Point #13)
Do not agree with reducing average lot size below 0.8 hectares. The minimum lot size should be large enough to ensure each lot contains sufficient developable area to accommodate the drilling of a well, a sewage system and other desired amenities, e.g. pool area.

The provision for lots smaller than 0.8 ha. will only apply if the adequacy of the lot for private services can be demonstrated.

04.2.4.0 18( ) (Point #14)
A policy should be included which will prohibit the resubdivision of approved subdivision plan lots through the consent application process.

As any resubdivision would have to demonstrate adequacy of the new lot to accommodate private services, there is no need for a blanket prohibition.

04.2.5.0 19( ) (Points #15 & #16)
20 See comments on Section 10.1.

Response is provided in Section 10.1.

05.2.0.0 00( ) (Point #17)
Does not disagree with this section. Attention is drawn to an MNR, MOE, MMA accord on pits and quarries.

This section has not been changed.

07.1.0.0 01( ) (Point #18)
Concurs with this objective.

This has been maintained.

07.2.1.0 01( )
02
03
04
05
06
07

(Points #19 to #24 & #26)
We have no objections to the proposed policies for floodplains.

The policies were adopted by Council with only minor rewordings to policies 5 and 6.

10.0.0.0 01( )
02
03
04
05

(Point #25)
We agree with the identified regional interests.

The Plan adopted by Council retains these interests.

07.2.2.0 08( )
09
10
11
12

(Points #27 to #31)
No objections to the proposed policies for organic soils and unstable slopes.

This has been maintained.

07.2.3.0 13( )
14
15

(Points #32 to #34)
The airport noise policies are generally acceptable.

The approach has been simplified to reflect provincial policy for development between NEF/NEP 30 and NEF/NEP 35. This changes policy 13 and deletes policy 15 of the draft plan.

07.2.3.0 17( )
18
19

(Points #35 to #37)
The policies are generally acceptable.

Reference to roads, railways and transitways has been added to policy 17 (now policy 19). The general approach has been maintained.

07.2.3.0 16( )

(Point #38)
Clarification is required as to which agency will review noise studies. Transport Canada is the appropriate agency but MOE wishes to be advised of Transport Canada's recommendations.

Both Transport Canada and the Ministry of the Environment will be involved (see new policy 17). There is no longer a distinction between inside and outside the greenbelt in policy 16.

07.2.3.0 20( )

(Point #39)
A rewording is suggested as follows "Council shall seek the advice of the Ministry of the Environment in implementing policy 19 for noise sources including provincial highways, railways, airports and major industries, but not necessarily regional and local roads".

The policy has been reworded. Council will seek the advice of the Ministry of the Environment for noise emanating from provincial highways and railways.

10.0.0.0 01( )
02
03
04
05

(Points #40 to #43)
We agree with the identified regional interests.

The Plan adopted by Council retains these interests.

10.1.0.0 01( )
02
03
04

(Points #44 to #47)
We agree with these objectives.

The Plan adopted by Council retains these objectives.

10.1.2.0 00( )

(Point #48)
This section is not clear relating to the matter of ownership of communal water systems. It is our understanding that the Regional Act requires regional ownership of "water works" as defined in the Ontario Water Resources Act. It is recommended that the region retain ownership, although MOE agrees with the concept of an operating/maintainance agreement with property owners if desired.

The ownership of a communal water system by the Region is not essential for the safe operation and maintenance of such systems. Agreements between the developer or owners of water systems and the Region are required which specify operation and maintenance requirements and takeover and cost-recovery by the Region in case of failure of the water system.

10.1.2.0 07(a)

(Point #49)
It is not clear if the policy allows an exemption for multiple unit development in areas not requiring a zoning change. It is important that ownership and "operating/maintenance agreement" policies be applied to all multiple-unit developments. It is advisable in the case of water works that the regional municipality retain ownership of the water system and enter into an operating/maintenance agreement with the property owner.

The policy has been reworded to make it clear that a rezoning is required in all cases. It is not necessary for the Region to have ownership of these systems provided its interests are adequately protected by an agreement with the developer.

10.1.2.0 07(b)

(Point #50)
It is not clear if the policy allows an exemption from multiple unit development in areas not requiring a zoning change. It is important that ownership and operating/maintenance agreement policies be applied to all multiple unit developments. It is advisable in the case of private communal sewage systems that the area municipality retain ownership of the sewage system and enter into an operating/maintenance agreement with the property owner.

The policy has been reworded to make it clear that a rezoning is required in all cases. There is no requirement for the area municipality to have ownership of the system provided its responsibilities are adequately protected by an agreement with the developer.

10.1.2.0 08(a)

(Point #51)
Natural water quality requirements should be defined as in the provincial drinking water objectives.

Agree, the text now refers to quality of ground water either meeting or exceeding Ontario Drinking Water Objectives (1983).

10.1.2.0 08(b)

(Point #52)
Concur with the statement "the site can support the continued and safe operation of private sewage disposal systems".

The Plan adopted by Council retains this policy.

10.1.2.0 09( ) (Point #53)
The Ministry does not disagree. However the statement implies a site specific hydrogeological study could be required for each consent application.

It is not expected that site specific hydrogeology studies will be required unless dealing in an area where problems are known to exist.

10.1.2.0 10( ) (Point #54)
No objection to the proposed phasing of large subdivisions and agree that this will allow better monitoring and control during the approval and development process.

The Plan adopted by Council retains a similar policy on phasing registration of plans of subdivision. The policy however, has been changed to increase the limit from 35 lots to 40.

10.2.0.0 00( ) (Point #55)
Comments were provided on this on 15 June 1987.

These comments have been considered.

10.2.2.0 00( ) (Point #56)
The Regional Municipality should assume the lead role in the administration and implementation of these policies.

The Region sets the framework through its official plan but as stated in the policies the details of implementation will involve many agencies.

10.2.2.0 05( ) (Point #57)
They recommend that the word "may" be changed to "shall" to ensure that new development does conform to requirements of the Master Drainage Plans.

This policy has been changed. Policy 6 now refers to "shall".

10.2.2.0 01( ) (Point #58)
Question the words "unless in Council's opinion such a plan is not necessary" but they agree that Council should have this option provided the decision is made on environmental considerations.

This policy has been changed. Policy 2 states what process will be followed in deciding whether a master drainage plan is necessary.

10.3.2.0 01( ) (Points #59 to #61)
02 Agree with policies on waste management.
03

The Plan adopted by Council retains these policies.

Brief #63: Mr. Douglas Kelly, Soloway, Wright et.al. (for Campeau Corporation)

00.0.0.0 00( ) B (Point #01)
River Ridge should be designated General Urban Area and Extensive Employment Area as proposed by City of Gloucester in its official plan amendment.

River Ridge has been designated South Urban Centre on Schedule B. This designation will be replaced by more specific designations such as General Urban Area and Extensive Employment Area by subsequent amendment to the official

plan once planning studies now underway by the City of Gloucester are complete.

02.2.0.0 02( ) (Point #02)
Should be revised to read "Lands inside the greenbelt, Kanata, Orleans and the south urban community in Nepean and Gloucester are approved for development subject to policies set out elsewhere in this plan. Wherever practicable lands shall be kept in agricultural production pending urban development. No development may be permitted which would hinder the ultimate development of urban centres where indicated."

Policy 2 in Part 2 in the Official Plan adopted by Regional Council has been amended to delete the distinction between Stage 1 and Stage 2 in the south urban centre, which is the intent of the suggested rewording.

02.2.0.0 03( ) (Point #03)
Delete the policy calling for a joint planning study and process the secondary plans prepared by Nepean and Gloucester.

Policy 3 in the Official Plan adopted by Regional Council no longer refers to a joint planning study. However, it requires an amendment to the Regional Official Plan to establish policies for the south urban centre at a similar level of detail to the regional policies for the Kanata and Orleans urban centres, before urban development may proceed.

02.2.0.0 05( ) (Point #04)
Delete policy 5.

The intent of this policy is to permit an initial phase of the South Urban Centre adjacent to Barrhaven before an amendment to the Regional Official Plan for the entire South Urban Centre has been approved. This flexibility exists in the Official Plan adopted by Regional Council in 1974 and approved by the Ontario Municipal Board and should not be lost.
This intent has been maintained in the revised Official Plan adopted by Regional Council but conditions have been stipulated. The location and size of the initial phase must not adversely affect matters of regional concern or involve Regional expenditure to provide sewers.

02.2.0.0 06( ) (Point #05)
Revise to read "municipal piped services may be extended to Urban Areas and to rural areas where specifically permitted on Schedule H to this Plan".

The policy in the Official Plan adopted by Regional Council now permits the extension of municipal piped services to Urban Areas, rather than Stage 1 Urban Areas, as suggested in this brief.

00.0.0.0 00( ) H (Point #06)
Schedule H should indicate the general manner in which trunk services will be extended to the whole of the south urban community in Nepean and Gloucester.

Schedule H relates only rural development to available servicing capacity. The intent is to provide a mechanism whereby Council can review proposed extensions of water and sewers

to the rural area and ensure that the capacity to be provided and the development to be permitted are similar.

Brief #64: Mr. Burritt Collins

04.1.0.0 00( ) (Point #01)
Foundation of a good residential area is quietness and the absence of frantic traffic.

Agree in principle but for existing neighbourhoods this may not always be possible.

00.0.0.0 00( ) D1 (Point #02)
Limebank Road should become the major regional road rather than River Road in Gloucester south of the airport.

The official plan adopted by Regional Council shows River Road rather than Limebank Road as the regional road in Gloucester south of the airport. However, there will be an amendment to the regional official plan once additional planning for the South Urban Centre is done. Council's decision for growth in the Gloucester portion of the South Urban Centre will likely require some additions to the regional road system. Limebank Road is a likely candidate.

Brief #65: Mr. J. Michael Noonan, Minto Construction Limited

00.0.0.0 00( ) C1 (Point #01)
Minto is concerned that the Blackburn Hamlet Bypass Extension bisects their holding which is 160 acres south of Innes Road. Concern that the alignment will sterilise part of the proposed plan of subdivision. As land supply in the East Urban Community is becoming depleted, their lands should not be removed from development. They support construction of Blackburn Hamlet Bypass and the widening of Innes Road. If Committee and Council support an easterly extension of the Blackburn Hamlet Bypass, they suggest a different alignment further south at the edge of the Greenbelt or within the Ontario Hydro Power Corridor.

The location of the Blackburn Hamlet Bypass Extension (Navan Road to Trim Road) has been moved southward to the vicinity of Hydro Corridor on Schedule C1. Proposed regional roads are shown on Schedule C1 in approximate locations only. Studies will now be undertaken to determine the precise location and property requirements for the Bypass Extension. There may still be some impact on the southern part of Minto's holding in the vicinity of Navan Road.

Brief #66: Mr. Joe Courtney, Federation of Citizens Associations

11.2.2.0 00( ) (Point #01)
Support for the priorization of roads into Tier 1 and Tier 2 system.

There is no "tiering" of road improvements in the official plan adopted by Regional Council. Council will determine the priority of improvements to the regional road system in its five-year capital budget forecast in the context of monitoring reports and other indicators of need.

01.3.0.0 00( ) (Point #02)
An income analysis should be part of the housing demand forecast and staff should broaden its ambit to examine land consumption if everyone in need were to be affordably housed.

It is not possible to project incomes and the other factors which affect housing affordability, particularly interest rates, with any reliability over a 10 or 20 year period. The land requirements do assume that all the projected population has adequate accommodation.

11.1.0.0 01( ) (Point #03)
Urge that high modal splits be maintained or improved and that automobile traffic be discouraged as much as possible.

In Policy 12 of Part 11, Council adopts guidelines for transit share (modal splits) which meet or exceed current levels. These guidelines will be considered in setting priorities among road and transit projects (policy 13).

03.1.3.0 02( ) (Point #04)
Support for proposal to link commercial/employment centres with transit use by encouraging large scale development near the site of transit stations.

The revised Official Plan adopted by Regional Council continues to encourage large scale development near transitway stations.

03.2.3.1 03( ) B (Point #05)
Expansion of Carlingwood Shopping Centre is not supported since it is not at a transitway station.

Regional Council does not establish a gross leasable area ceiling for Carlingwood Shopping Centre. This matter is under study by the City of Ottawa. Trilea Centres Inc. has agreed not to submit any site plan proposal for a period of eighteen months while the City completes its study.

01.3.0.0 00( ) (Point #06)
[Archie Campbell - spoken] RMOC projections may be over-optimistic.

There is no change in the projections between the May 1987 draft and the revised official plan adopted by Regional Council. Actual growth in population and households as reported in the Censuses for 1981 and 1986 and growth in employment 1981 to 1986 based on RMOC Planning Department surveys all exceeded these projections, suggesting that the projections may be conservative. However, economic growth is cyclical and it is not anticipated that the high growth experienced in 1981 to 1986 can be sustained over a 20 year period.

03.1.3.2 00( ) (Points #07 & #08)
3 [Archie Campbell - spoken] Parking standards should be reduced for development at sites near transitway stations.

It is likely that higher levels of transit use for travel to development near transitway stations will reduce the need for parking. Area municipalities establish and maintain parking standards through their respective zoning by-laws. Some experience with the combined impact of mixed uses and convenient transitway access on parking requirements may be desirable before local municipalities make decisions on amended parking standards. Regional policy focuses on initiatives to promote transit use, e.g. provision of park and ride facilities at selected

transitway stations, rather than on disincentives to automobile use.

Brief #67: Mr. Ken Silver, Cedarlane Estates

00.0.0.0 00( ) AB (Point #01)

East 1/2 lot 26 conc. 12 Goulbourn. Should be included in the urban area of the Village of Stittsville because it would square off the village boundary. It is not possible to farm the land although it is designated agricultural. It would assist in relieving traffic on Hazeldean Road through the development of Maple Grove Road. The frontage is zoned highway-commercial.
Having provided jobs by developing the frontage as highway-commercial, it is advisable to have residential development close by and the Township is interested in developing 20 acres for a major park complex in lot 27 conc. 12. Services already exist.

The land has been designated General Rural. Having regard to the need to establish the south urban centre and the transportation facilities potentially available to service the western part of the urban area, no boundary expansion of Stittsville has been made apart from accommodating Amendment 54 to the Goulbourn official plan and expanding the urban area to the proposed Stittsville bypass.

Brief #68: Mr. Ken Silver, 511376 Ontario Limited

00.0.0.0 00( ) B (Point #01)

Lot 26 concession 11 Goulbourn. This land should be designated residential rather than extensive employment because Goulbourn Township has approved it in principle. The land is flanked on the western side by residential and the natural features of the site relate more to relate more to residential and would be wasted as industrial. And the region has a 35-year industrial land supply and piped services are available.

In the official plan adopted by Regional Council, this land has been designated General Urban Area, which permits residential development.

Brief #69: Mr. Garry Stamm, Ottawa-Carleton Home Builders Association

01.2.0.0 00( ) (Point #01)

Add a new goal dealing with an effective and competitive market structure as an explicit official plan goal.

Additional words have been added to the first goal (Section 1.2) of the revised official plan adopted by Regional Council so that it now reads:
"Provide for an amount and variety of housing and employment adequate to meet the requirements of the projected population with an effective and competitive market structure".

06.1.0.0 01( ) (Point #02)

Add a 25-year horizon for residential land designation.

The Plan provides sufficient urban residential land to the year 2011, based on projected requirements, plus an additional reserve over and above projected needs.

06.1.0.0 01( ) (Point #03)
Add a 12-year horizon for zoned land.

The zoning of land is a local municipal responsibility. The Region designates land in the Official Plan for residential and other purposes. The Plan designates more than a 25-year supply of urban residential land. In addition, Policy 11 of Section 2.1.6 contains the objective that a minimum 10 years supply of residential land serviced with regional watermains and trunk sewers be maintained. These provisions are considered adequate to address the concern expressed in the brief.

06.1.0.0 01(a) (Point #04)
Increase the 2-year supply of vacant residential land to 5-year supply.

Regional Council considers the objective for a minimum two-year supply of vacant residential land by housing type in draft approved and registered plans of subdivision (Objective 1a in Section 6.1) to be adequate. The supply of land for single detached housing (as measured by number of units actually built) ranged from 1.3 to 2.1 years supply between 1984 and 1986. The supply for multiples ranged from 2.2 to 4.5 years. New housing price increases as measured by Statistics Canada for the period were 2.8, 0.3 and 4.0 per cent in 1984, 1985 and 1986 respectively, averaging less than inflation.

06.1.0.0 00( ) (Point #05)
Add an objective of approved location choice to be responsive to the public through the market monitor.

The Plan designates sufficient land dispersed across a number of locations to allow for reasonable locational choice. Addition of an objective that location be responsive to the market was not recommended as this could result in conflict with the Regional Development Strategy (Part 2 of the Plan). The location of future urban areas should take into account all relevant factors, not simply some measurement of demand for a specific location.

06.1.0.0 00( ) (Point #06)
Add an objective of competitive ownership pattern.

The objective of a competitive land ownership pattern was not recommended because the Region has very little power to control this aspect of the market. Residential land ownership patterns are monitored as part of the Planning Department's Vacant Urban Residential Land Survey. Residential land ownership has not become more concentrated in recent years. It is expected that monitoring of this item will continue as part of the annual vacant residential land review called for under Section 6.2.2 (Policy 6) of the Plan.

06.2.2.0 06( ) (Point #07)
Change 2-year supply to 5-year horizon.

Regional Council consider the objective for a minimum two-year supply of vacant residential land by housing type in draft approved and registered plans of subdivision (Objective 1a in Section 6.1) to be adequate. The supply of land for single detached housing (as measured by num-

ber of units actually built) ranged from 1.3 to 2.1 years supply between 1984 and 1986. The supply for multiples ranged from 2.2 to 4.5 years. New housing price increases as measured by Statistics Canada for the period were 2.8, 0.3 and 4.0 per cent in 1984, 1985 and 1986 respectively, averaging less than inflation.

01.3.0.0 00( )

(Point #08)
This part should be amended to take account that infrastructure capacity planning should consider the 30-40 year period and that the official plan should designate land for a 25-year planning horizon i.e. the year 2011. (This is dealt with in 1.4).

Section 1.3 was not amended between the May 1987 draft and the revised official plan adopted by Regional Council. However, Section 1.4 contains the statement that "piped services are planned and built for a useful life of 50 years or more". The amount of designated urban land in the revised official plan adopted by Regional Council exceeds the forecast of developed urban land in 2011.

01.3.0.0 00( )

(Point #09)
All the growth dimensions (jobs, population, households and urban land) are dramatically under-projected. Severe land shortages will result as actual growth greatly exceeds planned capacity.

The case for "under projection" is that actual growth from 1981 to 1986 exceeded the projections in the draft official plan. Population and employment growth from 1981 to 1986 did exceed the projections in the official plan. However, household growth, which is most directly related to the consumption of residential land, did not exceed the projection. Actual growth from 1981 to 1986 was 27,635 households, compared to a projected increase of 60,000 for the period 1981 to 1991. Housing starts 1981 to 1986, which Stamm (mistakenly) compared to the household projection, exceed the actual change in households because some starts replaced units which were demolished or converted to other uses or contributed to a rise in the vacancy rate. The urban land requirements in the official plan take account of both the projected increase in households and the additional units required to replace demolitions, etc.

Stamm does not propose alternative projections but suggests that the projections in the plan are too low, because they do not assume relatively recent high rates of land consumption will be maintained throughout the period. The urban land designated in the official plan adopted by Regional Council exceeds the projected requirements in 2011 by 3,800 hectares. This surplus for effective market operation provides sufficient urban land even if the high rates of land consumption of the 1981 to 1986 period are maintained.

Staff have undertaken a careful analysis of the underlying reasons for growth, including job creation, natural increase, and migration and household formation. The key aspects as far as Ottawa-Carleton is concerned are the demographic situation and the prospects for job creation. Demographics indicate that the rate of new households being formed will begin to decline

once the large generation of the baby boom has passed through the household formation stage. At this point, land consumption rates will only be sustained if job creation is high enough to result in more net in-migration to Ottawa-Carleton. Staff will continue to monitor all of these variables and changes, if warranted, may be introduced at the 5-year review of the official plan and by amendment at any time.

02.1.3.0 00( )

(Point #10)
Population inside the greenbelt is likely to drop. The drop in the Orleans growth rate is unrealistic. Density targets of 12.65 persons per acre are very high; 9.5-10.5 would be more realistic. The Plan leads to ownership pattern with few owners.

Population inside the greenbelt did drop from 1976 to 1981 from 445,100 to 443,055. Since more than 16,000 new dwelling units were added inside the greenbelt during that period, the population drop of approximately 2,000 can be attributed to declining average household size which fell from a regional average of 2.9 persons per household to 2.7. Since 1981 the rate of decline in household size has slowed falling to 2.6 in 1986. From 1981 to 1986 population inside the greenbelt grew by almost 12,900 (occupied dwelling units grew by 13,400). The main impact of declining household size has already occurred. Further small declines in household size can be offset by new construction as happened in the 1981 to 1986 period resulting in a stable population inside the greenbelt or a slight increase in population. The drop in the Orleans growth rate referred to was part of a discussion in the Transmittal Report which accompanied the May 1987 draft official plan. It is not fundamental to any aspect of the official plan.
The new official plan does not establish density targets for the urban centres expressed in persons per acre of developed urban land. The official plan establishes minima and maxima in terms of dwelling units for each urban centre. Evaluation of plans and proposals for vacant residential lands in the Kanata and Orleans urban centres indicates potential numbers of dwelling units in the desired ranges. There is no apparent reason why the south urban centre should differ. There is no mechanism to prevent the same developers who presently own major portions of the vacant urban land in Ottawa-Carleton from acquiring newly designated urban land. Designating additional urban land provides no assurances that ownership will be any less concentrated.

10.1.2.0 01( )

(Point #11)
Should commit to Green Creek plant expansion and accelerate Lynwood and West Rideau Collectors.

The Green Creek plant expansion and the construction of the Watts Creek Relief sewer system will be substantially completed before construction of the West Rideau Collector south of the inner limit of the greenbelt. The completion of the facilities is contigent on the availability of sufficient funds.

02.2.0.0 01( ) (Point #12)
Expand designated lands in west, east and south urban centres and add another centre focused on Leitrim.

The official plan adopted by Regional Council has added relatively small amounts of designated land to the East and West Urban Centres and to Stittsville. An urban area of approximately 500 ha has been added in the vicinity of Leitrim, and there is no longer any staging of the South Urban Centre in the official plan. A proposal by the Township of Cumberland for additional expansion of the East Urban Centre was referred to Planning Committee by Council.

02.1.6.0 11( ) (Point #13)
There should be a crash program to accelerate subdivision approvals processing, and provide for a 12-year supply of zoned land which should be in place by 1989.

Timely processing of applications for plans of subdivision is a matter of concern to everyone. The requirements and process are largely established by the Planning Act, 1983 and the order which delegated approval powers from the Ministry of Municipal Affairs to the Region. The Official Plan adopted by Regional Council contains an objective of maintaining a minimum of 10 years supply of residential land with trunk services, calculated on a regional basis. This equates roughly to the concept of "zoned" land in this brief. Achievement of this objective will require a major financial commitment.

Brief #70: Mr. Ray Essiambre, Cummings Cockburn Limited (for Richcraft Homes)

01.2.0.0 00( ) (Point #01)
Support the goals in particular numbers 1, 2 and 8.

The goals in the revised official plan adopted by Regional Council are unchanged from the May 1987 draft except that reference to "an effective and competitive market structure" has been added to the first goal.

01.3.0.0 00( ) (Point #02)
The market trend is consistent with the region's projections.

There is no change in the projections between the May 1987 draft and the revised official plan adopted by Regional Council.

00.0.0.0 00( ) C1 (Point #03)
Support for the alignment of the Inner Ring Road and Hunt Club Road as shown on C1.

There has been no change to the alignments of Hunt Club Road and the Inner Ring Road (now called the Inner Provincial Highway Bypass) between the May 1987 draft and the official plan adopted by Regional Council.

00.0.0.0 00( ) B (Point #04)
Support the change of designation from "industrial" to "residential" in south Ottawa, east of Conroy Road.

In the official plan adopted by Regional Council, this land has been designated General

Urban Area, which permits residential development.

Brief #71: Ms. Marion Seymour, Marion Seymour, Consultant (for the Bradley Family)

00.0.0.0 00( ) AB (Point #01)
Land south of the east urban community adjacent to the Greenbelt is similar to the land designated for urban purposes. I support Gloucester's official plan amendments 9 and 47. The land cannot support economic agricultural endeavours. Development close by has made it most difficult to continue farming. There is existing water service on Navan Road and Fourth Line Road.

When Regional Council considered the new regional official plan, it referred a proposal to expand the East Urban Centre to the south, which included Gloucester's Official Plan Amendments 9 and 47 to Planning Committee.

00.0.0.0 00( ) AB (Point #02)
City of Gloucester has made provision for the extension of sanitary sewer services to the area. The lands are closer to the centre of the urban area and more easily serviced than any other potential urban lands under consideration.

It is agreed that the extension of sanitary sewers to this area would not be difficult, however, provision of transportation services (road and transit) is more problematic. One element of the development strategy in the new official plan adopted by Regional Council is to plan, service and see established a south urban centre growing out from the existing Barrhaven to take advantage of available road capacity in this corridor and ameliorate the increasing pressures on east-west roads.

Brief #72: Ms. Marion Seymour , Marion Seymour, Consultant

08.3.2.0 02( ) (Point #01)
There is an inequity in how lands are treated in the River Corridors with regard to their permitted uses. Land between the river and the road is designated marginal resource (river corridor), now general rural area (river corridor), which permits a greater variety of development than land between the road and the outer limit of the river corridor designation which is generally designated agricultural resource (river corridor). It is understood that this area has not been part of the review of the official plan. Therefore it would be helpful if Planning Committee were to ask staff to review this matter.

The reason for the difference is that much of the land between the road and the river is too fragmented to be agriculturally viable. This does not apply to lands on the "land" side of the road.

Brief #73: Mr. S.A. Cunliffe, City of Nepean

02.2.0.0 05( ) (Point #01)
Strongly supports the development strategies outlined in the draft official plan and in particular policy 5.

The development strategy in the Official Plan adopted by Regional Council has been modified in that the distinction between Stage 1 and Stage 2 lands in the South Urban Centre has been deleted. There is still a policy which permits

development of an initial phase of the South Urban Centre adjacent to Barrhaven before an amendment to the regional official plan for the entire South Urban Centre is approved.

01.7.2.0 05( )

(Point #02)
This policy should be expanded to also provide for development which has been committed at the local level. In addition limited infilling and restoration in case of fire or decay should be recognized.

This policy has not been amended in the revised official plan adopted by Regional Council; although a number of site specific amendments have been incorporated to continue existing development rights as designated in local official plans. The policy as adopted provides for limited infilling, e.g. a vacant lot in a residential enclave. Non-conforming rights to replacement in case of fire, etc. are ordinarily established in zoning by-laws which are the responsibility of area municipalities.

02.1.6.0 00( )

(Point #03)
Para. 6 last sentence. This should be clarified to provide for the servicing of stage 1 south urban centre if alternative methods of financing the cost of services are determined. In order to correct servicing deficiencies in the east and west special local or regional charges including municipal contributions need to be examined. A more flexible policy should be stated which provides for the commitment to servicing in the east and west but still permits servicing of the south to proceed.

Policy 1 in Part 10 of the revised Official Plan adopted by Regional Council specifies trunk sewers to be substantially completed in the Orleans and Kanata urban centres before Regional expenditure on trunk sewers for the south urban centre. The wording permits servicing of the south urban centre to proceed if Regional expenditure is not involved.

02.2.0.0 03( )

(Point #04)
Concern expressed about the word "jointly" Recommended that the policy be amended to state that a study be undertaken IMMEDIATELY to determine appropriate policies for the provision of regional services and other planning concerns.

Policy 3 in the Official Plan adopted by Regional Council no longer refers to a joint planning study. However, it requires an amendment to the regional Official Plan to establish policies for the south urban centre at a similar level of detail to the regional policies for the Kanata and Orleans urban centres, before urban development may proceed. The initiative for planning of the south urban centre now rests with the Cities of Nepean and Gloucester.

02.2.0.0 04( )

(Point #05)
Preliminary studies indicate that there will not be enough land suitable for residential development to provide for the maximum (20,000 households) in the stage 1 area. It is necessary to develop at least one neighbourhood for approximately 5,000 people south of the Jock River.

The need for urban land south of the Jock River will be determined in planning for the south

urban centre which will result in an amendment to the regional official plan to establish policies for the south urban centre at a similar level of detail to those for the Kanata and Orleans urban centres (e.g. boundaries, location of town centre). The official plan adopted by Regional Council provides for a maximum of 22,000 dwelling units in the Nepean portion of the South Urban Centre.

03.1.1.0 00( )

(Point #06)
The Plan has struck a good balance with respect to guiding development in order to achieve regional objectives in the urban area while still providing for a variety of development opportunities.

Section 3.1.1. of the Region's revised Official Plan remains substantially unchanged from the May 1987 draft version.

00.0.0.0 00( ) B

(Point #07)
The north side of Richmond Road and Robertson Road in Bells Corners should be designated general urban area rather than extensive employment area to permit community sized shopping facilities in this area.

This land is designated Extensive Employment Area in the official plan adopted by Regional Council, however Community Shopping Centres are permitted in Extensive Employment Areas subject to specific criteria set out in policy 7 of Section 3.2.3.2.

03.4.3.0 01(a)

(Point #08)
Clarification is required to make it clear it is not meant to apply to the urban area in general.

In the revised official plan adopted by Regional Council, the wording has been changed to "discrete clusters of contiguous non-residential uses". This wording makes it clearer that there is no intent to set a limit on the number of such aggregations/discrete clusters in areas designated General Urban Area (by either area municipality, urban centre or any other basis).

03.4.3.0 03(c)

(Point #09)
The word "shall" should be changed to "should".

The word "shall" is used in the official plan adopted by Regional Council. Provision must be made for safe and convenient pedestrian and bicycle travel. This may be done using the road system, but if not, i.e. if a circuitous road pattern results in inconveniently lengthy trips, direct pedestrian and/or bicycle links shall be provided.

03.4.3.0 05(c)

(Point #10)
It is recommended that this policy be deleted and replaced with a policy which requires that sun shadows of taller buildings be minimised through locational, building design and site planning criteria.

Policy 5c) of Section 3.4.3 of the revised official plan adopted by Regional Council is unchanged from the May 1987 draft. The intent is to minimize shading of low density residential areas. If factors other than location contribute to minimizing shading, they

can be taken into account. A good choice of location may eliminate the need for detailed consideration of the impact on shading of building design and site plan at subsequent stages of the planning process.

04.2.3.0 15( )

(Point #11)
This policy should be clarified as to whether all lots or an average of all lots can be less than 0.8 hectares and it should make clear what land uses can be included to determine the density of the development as a whole.

This has been reworded to make it clear that the 0.8 ha has to be averaged over all the land in the development (now policy 16).

04.2.4.0 18( )

(Point #12)
Infilling should also be permitted to allow rounding off of existing development where natural boundaries are used. The Rideau Glen Marina property in lot 18 Concession A is an example.

The infilling policy in the official plan adopted by Regional Council (now policy 19) still provides that infilling shall "not result in extensions in length or depth", i.e. no "rounding off". The following policy was also added to the policies for noise in Section 7.2.3 which pertains to infilling of the Rideau Glen property:
"Notwithstanding policy 13 above, for the lands on Rideau Glen Drive in the City of Nepean, residential infilling by plan of subdivision may be permitted above the NEF/NEP 35, subject to appropriate noise control measures and notifications on title of the potential noise levels."

05.1.3.2 00( )

(Point #13)
The Region should require local official plans to include policies appropriate to their agricultural economy recognising past policies and severance activity. The proposed regional policies can be viewed as a minimum requirement.

It has always been our interpretation that the Regional Official Plan policies are a minimum requirement and that local official plans can be more restrictive if they wish.

05.1.3.2 04( )

(Point #14)
It should be clarified to make it clear that the farmer must now be retiring.

This has been done.

05.1.3.2 05(d)

(Point #15)
It should be amended to reflect that access to a regional road should only be permitted where there is no reasonable alternative access.

This has been done.

05.1.3.3 08( )

(Point #16)
The area restriction of 4 hectares is arbitrary and should instead be established in local official plans.

The official plan adopted by Regional Council permits lot sizes of 2 hectares or more.

07.2.3.0 03( ) (Point #17)
Policy should be amended to permit residential development between NEF/NEP 30-35 contour outside the greenbelt subject to the approval of necessary studies required in policies 3 and 5 of Section 2.2.

This distinction between land inside and land outside the greenbelt has been removed. Residential development between NEF/NEP 30-35 is permitted, subject to conditions.

07.2.3.0 15( ) (Point #18)
Areas outside the greenbelt where limited infilling is desirable should be subject to policies 15 and 16.

There is no longer a distinction between inside and outside the greenbelt, so that infilling is also possible outside the greenbelt.

Brief #74: Mr. Robert D. McKay, Township of Goulbourn

02.2.0.0 04( ) AB (Point #01)
The 4,000 household provision in policy 4 seriously underestimates the potential development of Stittsville. 15,000-17,600 people could be accommodated within the approved boundaries. As an alternative Stittsville should be allowed to grow to the limits of its sewage capacity as guided by an update to the Stittsville secondary plan without regional official plan amendment. Because Stittsville is located on poor agricultural land it is distant from major land use conflicts. It is served by existing full urban services with a capacity for growth. Sufficient lands are designated industrial to have a balanced community. The area is well serviced by paved arterial roads. Community facilities are now in place and the Stittsville area is largely wooded and rolling, aesthetically superior for residential development. The extra population is required to have a better level of OC Transpo service and better shopping facilities.

The Official Plan adopted by Regional Council provides for a maximum of 6,000 households in Stittsville, i.e. a population of approximately 18,000.

02.2.0.0 04( ) (Point #02)
Would like clarification on how 5,000 jobs for Stittsville were arrived at. Opposes any form of tying residential development to industrial development.

The Official Plan adopted by Regional Council provides for a maximum of 6,000 dwelling units and 7,000 jobs in Stittsville. This represents slightly more than one job per dwelling unit which is a desirable level of local work opportunities, if Stittsville is to be more than a bedroom community. Land use and development policies in the local official plan must create the opportunity for this balance; however, neither the May 1987 draft Plan nor the Official Plan adopted by Regional Council attempt to tie the timing of residential development to industrial development.

10.1.2.0 05( ) H (Point #03)
The regional official plan should allow Richmond to grow to 5,500 in stage 1 and 8,500 in stage 2 without an amendment to the regional official plan.

Policy 6 of Section 10.1.2 has been amended to recognize the number of dwellings that relate to a population of 8,500. However, whether Richmond will be able to grow this large will depend on the capacity of the aquifer.

05.1.3.2 03(a)

(Point #04)
This is not clear. It is recommended that a severance only be permitted if previous severances have not occurred. Suggest rewording as follows "Generally not more than one lot for each farmer owning a farm in Ottawa-Carleton on the date of the adoption of this plan for either retirement or farm help purposes. Discretion may be exercised by the local municipal council on the merits of each case".

The policies have been reworded to permit both retirement and farm help lots subject to certain criteria, including that a lot for the intended purpose has not already been created from the farm holding.

05.1.3.0 02( )

(Point #05)
Requests a new policy supporting the right to farm movement be added.

The matter of the "right to farm" is to be dealt with by the Province and the Plan should not commit itself until the Province's proposals are known.

05.1.3.3 06( )

(Point #06)
Supported as it adds some flexibility in prime agricultural lands.

This has been maintained.

05.1.3.3 07( )

(Point #07)
Supported as it adds some flexibility in prime agricultural lands.

Policy has been reworded but intent remains.

05.1.3.3 08( )

(Point #08)
Supported as it adds some flexibility in prime agricultural lands.

This policy has been maintained.

00.0.0.0 00( ) A

(Point #09)
Concern that the Richmond Marsh north of the Jock River has been taken out of environmental conservation and protection. The area is not suitable for estate lot development or sub-division.

This area is to be considered as part of the review of policies for Natural Environment Areas.

00.0.0.0 00( ) D1

(Point #10)
The Stittsville By-pass is an essential element of future planning for Stittsville and the right of way must be protected by its designation.

The Stittsville Bypass is not included on Schedule D1 in the official plan adopted by Regional Council. This Bypass is more of a local need than a regional need and is appropriately protected by designation in the local official plan. The boundary of the Stittsville urban area on Schedule A was,

however, shifted westward to the proposed location of the Bypass to assist the Township of Goulbourn in its implementation. In Policy 9 of Part 2 Council states that it shall incur no cost for the construction of infrastructure relating to the development of this additional land in Stittsville.

01.7.2.0 00( )

(Point #11)
A new policy should be included in the official plan limiting the time used by Ministries and agencies to respond to local official plan amendments to 60 days. If no response is received in 60 days the agency or ministry should be deemed to have no objection to the official plan amendment.

The response time for provincial ministries and other external agencies on circulations of local official plan amendments is determined by provincial regulations; it is not a matter for determination in the regional official plan.

00.0.0.0 00( ) A

(Point #12)
Lots 24, 25 conc. 9, Goul., should not be agricultural resource as the land is poor quality pasture land and bush and a high rock table (McGuire Faulkner Davidson).

This has been changed to General Rural.

00.0.0.0 00( ) A

(Point #13)
Part of the E. half of lot 11 conc. 8 Goul. is a major rock quarry operated by Kavanaugh Construction and should be designated mineral resource area.

This is not a major deposit that warrants designation in the Regional Official Plan.

00.0.0.0 00( ) A

(Point #14)
The natural environment area should extend into concessions 2, 3, 4 and 5 north of the Jock River to accommodate the Richmond Fen, a provincially significant wetland.

This area is to be considered as part of the review of policies for Natural Environment Areas.

00.0.0.0 00( ) A

(Point #15)
Lot 1 in conc. 4 and 5 in Goulbourn are generally poorly drained and should be considered a natural environmental area.

As there is no evidence that this area has any special conservation value there is no basis for such a designation.

00.0.0.0 00( ) A

(Point #16)
Alan Sauve Property, Red Pine Estates should be general rural area rather than mineral resource area as the pit is exhausted and the Ministry of Natural Resources license has been returned.

The Mineral Resource designation has been replaced by General Rural.

00.0.0.0 00( ) A

(Point #17)
The land in concession 6 west of the Connelly Side Road in Goul. designated agricultural resource should be general rural area.

A reduction in the Agricultural Resource desig-

nation has been made in lot 12 but most of the rest of the land is class 2, 3 or 4 soil and has been designated Agricultural Resource.

00.0.0.0 00( ) A (Point #18)
The portions in Goulbourn of conc. 6 and 7 in lots 9 and 10 designated general rural should be designated agricultural resource.

The land in conc. 6 has been designated Agricultural Resource but not in conc. 7 as it is mostly class 6 soil with some 5 and 7.

00.0.0.0 00( ) A (Point #19)
The Carl Ashton property (part lot 25 and lot 26 conc. 10, Goulbourn should be entirely general rural as it is marginal agricultural land.

Lot 25 and N 1/2 of lot 26 have been designated general rural. However, the S 1/2 of lot 26 is class 3 soil and has been left as Agricultural Resource.

00.0.0.0 00( ) B (Point #20)
The Amberway South and Coates Property should be redesignated general urban rather than extensive employment area to correspond with Council's approval.

These properties have been designated General Urban Area in the official plan adopted by Regional Council.

00.0.0.0 00( ) AB (Point #21)
The land south of Stittsville should be altered to reflect amendment 54 to the Goulbourn official plan (McGuire, Bell, Clark and Faulkner).

This has been done.

Brief #75: Mr. Terrance Denison, Perley-Robertson, Panet, et.al. (for Terrace Investments Limited)

00.0.0.0 00( ) AB (Point #01)
Terrace Investments would like their lands in the Village of South March designated urban to allow them to build the development known as Riddell Village. In addition they have submitted an application to amend the existing regional official plan.

This has been done.

00.0.0.0 00( ) AB (Point #02)
Kanata adopted the proposal as a scheme they support under the Ministry of Housing's Senior Citizens Demonstration Program.

Riddell Village has been included in the urban area.

Brief #76: Mr. Lawrence D. Bradley, Cummings Cockburn Limited (for Elsett Realty)

00.0.0.0 00( ) B (Point #01)
Own 54 hectares at the northwest corner of old highway 7 and the Carp Road. They support the designation of general urban area.

This land is designated General Urban Area in the official plan adopted by Regional Council.

02.2.4.0 00( ) (Point #02)
They request that Stittsville's household potential be increased from 4,000 to 6,500 (20,150 population) because the Township of Goulbourn

servicing study has shown that the local sewer has the capability of supporting in excess of 20,000 people and that the regional sewer and pumping stations be upgraded to cater for this level of development.

The Official Plan adopted by Regional Council permits a maximum of 6,000 dwelling units in Stittsville, corresponding to a servicing capacity of approximately 18,000 people.

10.2.2.0 01( ) (Points #03 to #10)
02 Concur with policies as they apply to the
03 site and have undertaken works to conform to
04 them.
05
06 *These policies for storm water management have*
07 *been incorporated in slightly modified form.*
08

Brief #77: Mr. Mike Faulkner, Carleton Condominium Corporation #11

11.4.1.0 00( ) (Point #01)
The provision of the 5th paragraph should apply to existing residential development as well as future development.

In areas which are already substantially developed, it is not considered possible to achieve all the steps to enhance the role of public transit mentioned in this paragraph, e.g. collector road systems are already established. The steps are established as desirable objectives for such areas in policy 6 of section 3.4.3.

07.2.3.0 00( ) (Point #02)
The para. at the bottom of page 7-3 should apply to existing development as well as future development.

An official plan cannot require remedial noise measures for existing development.

00.0.0.0 00( ) F (Point #03)
They request that bicycle paths be developed in their area of the region particularly along Ogilvie Road and Montreal Road.

Provision of bicycle paths along Ogilvie Road and/or Montreal Road does not require their designation on Schedule F of the official plan, provided that they can be accommodated within the road allowance. The Transportation Department is now preparing a report on how bicycles could be better provided for on regional roads. Until this report is issued, it would be premature to designate additional bicycle corridors in the official plan.

11.4.1.0 00( ) (Point #04)
They would like an additional paragraph as follows "in the case of existing higher density developments that are adjacent to the proposed transit route, steps will be taken to ensure locating proposed transit stops within a 400 metre walking distance from the existing developments.

This is not always possible in cases of existing development.

07.2.3.0 00( ) (Point #05)
They propose an additional paragraph as follows "in the case of existing residential development measures should be taken such as the erection of

noise barriers to bring noise levels closer to the goal of 55 DBA between 7 a.m. and 11 p.m., and 50 DBA between 11:00 p.m. and 7:00 a.m.

An official plan cannot require remedial noise measures for existing development.

Brief #78: Ms. Lorraine M. Booth, Churchill Area Residents' Association

11.2.2.0 00( ) (Point #01)
Kirkwood Avenue extension should be included as a Tier 1 priority.

There is no "tiering" of road improvements in the official plan adopted by Regional Council. Council will determine the priority of improvements to the regional road system in its five-year capital budget forecast in the context of monitoring reports and other indicators of need. The need and timing for the Kirkwood Avenue extension is primarily dependent on the timing of high density development on lands north of Scott Street.

00.0.0.0 00( ) C1 (Point #02)
Support for the Kirkwood Avenue extension from Richmond Road to Scott Street. This is a community consensus reached after numerous meetings and the circulation of two petitions; it is also supported by the Westboro community association.

The Kirkwood Avenue extension from Richmond Road to Scott Street is in the official plan adopted by Regional Council.

Brief #79: Mr. Barry Wellar, Carlingwood Action Committee

03.2.3.0 01( ) (Point #01)
Safety-related problems in the vicinity of Carlingwood shopping centre.

The 1986 traffic accident rates for Regional road intersections in the vicinity of Carlingwood Shopping Centre and Fairlawn Plaza range from 0.55 to 0.82 accidents per million vehicles. The overall traffic accident rate average for Regional road intersections experiencing similar volumes is 0.78 accidents per million vehicles. The data on which the Regional traffic accident rate is based include vehicles, property and persons. Given these recent statistics the Regional road system in the vicinity of Carlingwood Shopping Centre and Fairlawn Plaza does not warrant immediate safety-related upgrades.

Brief #80: Mr. John Teevens

00.0.0.0 00( ) AB (Point #01)
The south 1/2 of lot 17 conc. 1 Rideau Front, City of Gloucester. Supports the south urban centre in Gloucester and would like to be designated commercial.

The South Urban Centre is designated on Schedule B of the official plan adopted by Regional Council. Commercial locations will be determined by planning that will be undertaken by the City of Gloucester.

Brief #81: Mr. Greig Soohen, Orleans South Community Association

00.0.0.0 00( ) C1 (Point #01)
Support for the Blackburn Bypass extension because it provides a second badly needed east/west road. It avoids the established communities of Chapel Hill, Orleans South and Queenswood Heights. It provides the industrial park with

better access and higher visibility. It does not preclude the development of the Minto area. It will pull east/west through traffic off Innes Road allowing Innes to become a local link road. Merchants in Blackburn Hamlet will benefit from this and it is environmentally the most sound route.

The Blackburn Hamlet Bypass Extension is included in the official plan adopted by Regional Council, however its location on Schedule C1 has been moved southwards to the vicinity of the Hydro corridor.

11.2.2.0 00( ) (Point #02)
Recognize improvements to Innes Road are required and they support the Tier 1 designation.

There is no "tiering" of road improvements in the official plan adopted by Regional Council. Council will determine the priority of improvements to the regional road system in its five-year capital budget forecast in the context of monitoring reports and other indicators of need.

Brief #82: Mr. David Husband, New Edinburgh Community Association

00.0.0.0 00( ) C1 (Point #01)
Requests that the Vanier Parkway extension to the MacDonald Cartier Bridge be deleted because there is a contradiction between the goals of the plan and the Vanier Parkway Extension, because some residents along Crichton Street have experienced difficulty in obtaining mortgages. Noise and fumes from vehicles particularly trucks will cause adverse environmental influence. A bridge between Orleans and Gatineau would provide better convenience of movement. It would be an eyesore from City Hall and External Affairs windows. The extension would cut off access to the Rideau R.; New Edinburgh Park would be destroyed. The extension would detract from the aesthetic quality of New Edinburgh and the Gov. General's grounds. Spending $20 m for a new road which is not needed is not minimising public cost.

The Vanier Parkway connection to the MacDonald Cartier bridge is included in the official plan adopted by Regional Council. The project will be subject to the requirements of the Environmental Assessment Act which places heavy emphasis on mitigation of impacts on the environment (social and natural).

Brief #83: Dr. Paul Laughton, Glabar Park Community Association

03.2.3.0 13( ) (Point #01)
Like the Carlingwood/Fairlawn Complex should be fixed at its present size. They are concerned that there appears to be two different figures being given for the size of the Carlingwood Shopping Centre.

Fairlawn is a Community Shopping Centre whose gross leasable area (up to a maximum of 35,000 sq. m.) may be determined by the City of Ottawa. Carlingwood is designated a Regional Shopping Centre on Schedule B of the revised Official Plan adopted by Regional Council. The Official Plan does not establish a maximum gross leasable area for Carlingwood. The City of Ottawa is doing a zoning review. When this is completed, Regional Council will establish a maximum. Trilieа Centres Inc. has agreed not to submit any site plan proposal for a period

of eighteen months while the City completes its study.

Brief #84: Dr. Dave Nichol, Ridgeview Community Association

11.2.0.0 00( ) (Point #01)
Concern at the shift of traffic from regional roads to local streets.

The fundamental thrust of the transportation component of the official plan adopted by Regional Council is to develop a transportation system (regional roads and transit) that meets the needs of the population served. If the regional road network that is identified on Schedules C1 and D1 is allowed to be developed, then the local road network will be reasonably well protected from the impact of regional traffic.

11.2.0.0 00( ) (Points #02 & #03)
The situation at the Baseline-Woodroffe intersection is becoming critical. Because the regional intersections at Greenbank-Baseline and Woodroffe-Baseline are under increasing duress, local streets are going to serve as escape routes.

Eventually some improvement will have to be carried out at the Baseline-Woodroffe intersection to deal with the ever increasing traffic impact of the Centrepointe Development. In the interim the construction of Highway 416 which will remove traffic from Greenbank and Woodroffe, and the completion of other links in the major road network, e.g., Hunt Club Road extension to Highway 416, will ease the situation.

11.2.0.0 00( ) (Point #04)
There appear to be 3 options a) reduce or limit the total amount of automobile traffic throughout the region, b) reduce or limit the amount of traffic that is allowed on local streets, c) control regional traffic that goes on to local streets so it behaves like local rather than drive through traffic.

Traffic is a by-product of the development permitted by zoning. The control of zoning, which is in the hands of the municipalities, is the only sure way of controlling the amount of traffic.

11.2.0.0 00( ) (Point #05)
Growth outside the area will bring increasing traffic onto the Regional Roads abutting Carleton Ward.

True.

11.2.1.0 00( ) (Point #06)
Accelerate the timing of widening Baseline Road (support this as a tier 1 facility?), and 15 other specific improvements to traffic control in the Carleton Ward Area.

Tiering no longer applies. The widening of Baseline Road will be evaluated each year along with all the other links in the regional road system and will be given its appropriate priority at budget time.

Brief #85: Ms. Catherine Lindquist, Proctor & Redfern Group (for Taysham Investors Inc.)

00.0.0.0 00( ) AB (Point #01)
The point is cross-referenced to brief 31. An error in the fourth paragraph of the letter has been corrected in this brief.

The Paracon lands, phase II, have been included in the urban area.

Brief #86: Mr. Andy Terauds, Ontario Institute of Agrologists - Ottawa Valley Branch

05.1.2.0 00( ) (Point #01)
The last para. insert after the words "farm issues", "based on the recommendations of the Agricultural Advisory Committee".

All reference to the proposed Agricultural Advisory Committee has been deleted in the official plan adopted by Council.

05.1.3.1 00( ) (Point #02)
The second paragraph insert a period after class 4 and delete "that was under production in 1985".

This has been reworded to "that showed evidence of being actively farmed".

05.1.3.1 01(g) (Point #03)
Substitute the word "shall" for the word "can".

This has been done.

05.1.3.1 01(h) (Point #04)
Substitute the word "shall" for the word "can".

This has been done.

05.1.3.1 01(i) (Point #05)
Delete "uses may be permitted in accordance with (a) to (e) and substitute "it shall be rehabilitated to its original capability for agriculture.

Just because a pit has been on the site is no reason why the after uses need be any different than if a pit had not been developed. Policies 1g) and 1h) require that sites originally of high capability for agriculture be rehabilitated so that productive agricultural use is possible.

05.1.3.1 02(c) (Point #06)
Delete "dated 1976" and add "or a replacement document".

It would be unwise to commit the Official Plan to a new Agricultural Code of Practice without knowing what it might contain.

05.1.3.1 02( ) (Point #07)
Add a sub-section d "the right to farm or similar policies".

It is premature to commit the Official Plan to the "right to farm" policies until the provincial policy position is known.

05.1.3.1 01( ) (Point #08)
A new section should be added on uses which are excluded in agricultural resource area which would include topsoil removal; no waste disposal sites should be permitted; no new right of

way corridors should be permitted if at all possible, and other uses should only be established after consultation with the Agricultural Advisory Committee.

The Plan establishes uses to be permitted and uses not listed generally would be excluded. However, if the regional official plan contains no reference to a use (e.g. fire stations). The location of such uses is regulated by local official plans and zoning by-laws.

05.1.3.2 03(d) (Point #09)
The words "and the Agricultural Advisory Committee" should be added to the end of this policy.

Council has removed all reference to an Agricultural Advisory Committee.

05.1.3.2 04( ) (Point #10)
Add, "for farm-help-purpose severance, the scale of the farming operation must justify the need to the satisfaction of the Agricultural Advisory Committee".

All references to the Agricultural Advisory Committee have been deleted, however the need for a farm help severance "must be demonstrated, having regard for the scale of the farming operation".

05.1.3.2 05(a) (Point #11)
Delete, "dated 1976" and add, "or a replacement document".

This has not been done as it is not prudent to give a commitment to a revised document without knowing its contents.

05.1.3.3 01( ) (Point #12)
Support

This has been maintained.

05.1.3.3 00( ) (Point #13)
Recommend deletion of the 2nd paragraph.

The paragraph has been amended but not deleted.

05.1.3.3 06( ) (Point #14)
Delete, "non-farm residential lots..." and substitute, "agriculture-related lots as identified in 1(e)".

This has not been done as the intent of this policy is to provide some opportunities for non-farm housing in addition to farm related severances.

05.1.3.3 06(d) (Point #15)
Delete 6 d) if the Committee wishes to keep emphasis on protection of the farmer, not the new house, and add a clause e) dealing with the Agricultural Code of Practice.

Staff do not see a distinction since if the house is protected from the impacts of agricultural operations, this will protect the farmer from complaints. Policy 7 in Section 5.1.3.3 requires that regard be had to the Agricultural Code of Practice.

05.1.3.3 08( ) (Point #16)
Four hectares is too large because of weeds.

The official plan adopted by Regional Council permits lot sizes of 2 hectares or greater.

05.1.3.4 09( ) (Point #17)
Add to the end of the policy, "The Agricultural Advisory Committee shall also respond to requests for assistance on agriculture-related topics from Council or any of its committees".

Reference to the Agricultural Advisory Committee has been deleted.

Brief #87: Mr. Ned Lathrop, Township of Cumberland

01.7.2.0 00( ) (Point #01)
The first paragraph should be amended to allow more time (2-3 years) to amend local official plans.

The revised official plan adopted by Regional Council continues to paraphrase the provision of the Planning Act, 1983 which states that if any local official plan or zoning by-law is not amended within one year after approval of a regional official plan, the council of the regional municipality may amend the plan or by-law as if it were the council of the area municipality.
Area municipalities will have more time to amend local official plans if they begin work upon Regional Council adoption of the revised official plan, rather than waiting for Ministerial or Ontario Municipal Board approval.

01.7.2.0 05( ) (Point #02)
The policy should be clarified so that existing development rights as provided and designated in local official plans will remain.

This policy has not been amended in the revised official plan adopted by Regional Council; although a number of site specific amendments have been incorporated to continue existing development rights as designated in local official plans.

01.7.2.0 06( ) (Point #03)
This policy should be clarified to ensure that areas designated in the east and west urban communities will be serviced by the Regional Municipality with piped services, roads and transit, up to the population level approved by the Ontario Municipal Board.

There is no change in this policy between the May 1987 draft and the revised official plan adopted by Regional Council. Policies in Parts 2, 10, and 11 of the Plan express Council's commitment to the provision of services to the east and west urban communities.

01.7.2.0 08( ) (Point #04)
The paragraph following clause (c) should be eliminated as well as clause (d). Site planning is a local municipal responsibility.

This policy is unchanged in the revised official plan adopted by Regional Council. Although the words "site or sites" are used, the policy applies only to amendments to the regional official plan. An example might be a

request to designate an additional regional shopping centre site.

02.1.3.0 00( ) (Point #05)
In paragraph 11, reference to 3,200 hectares should be clarified to the extent that the Region should confirm to the Township that 3,?00 hectares will support the OMB approved population level.

Based on existing development and proposals for vacant residential land, there is potential for approximately 28,600 dwelling units in the East Urban Centre. This will accommodate a population of 90,000 to 100,000 depending upon average household size.

02.1.4.0 00( ) (Point #06)
Paragraph 3 should be expanded to note that the solution to congestion is additional roads serving the east urban community which should have a priority status.

This paragraph has not been expanded. The official plan adopted by Regional Council does not contain any priorizing of road improvements. Instead Council decided that priorities would be "determined periodically in the context of monitoring reports, system status reports and studies on growth, traffic patterns, and other indicators of need". (policy 6, Section 11.2.2)

02.4.0.0 06( ) (Point #07)
Clarification should be provided on when Regional Council determined that additional lands in the Nepean portion of the south urban community should be brought into the Stage 1 designation.

The May 1987 draft Official Plan contained the Planning Department's recommendations to Planning Committee written as a draft Plan suitable for Council adoption. Regional Council's decision was made when it adopted the revised official plan.

02.1.4.0 05( ) (Point #08)
The following should be added to the objective "this shall include the provision of roadway services to meet growth requirements of the east and west urban communities to the boundaries and limits approved by the Ontario Municipal Board".

In the revised Official Plan adopted by Regional Council this objective continues to refer to trunk sewer and water services and not to roads. The objective deals with a staging policy which balances orderly and economical infrastructure provision with the need for an adequate supply of serviced urban land. Trunk sewer and water services are prerequisites to major urban development. Roads can be provided on a more incremental basis as development occurs and traffic demand increases.

02.1.5.0 09( ) (Point #09)
The following should be added..."specific priority will be given to providing transit services and capacity in the transportation system to meet the development requirements for the designated areas in the east urban community and west urban community".

Objective 9 in Part 2 deals with the principle that permissions for development should not

exceed the planned capacities of regional services; it does not deal with priorities.

02.1.6.0 00( ) (Point #10)
Paragraph 2 should include a reference to the problems occurring in the east urban community and west urban community.

This paragraph has not been amended in the revised Official Plan adopted by Regional Council, but Policy 1 in Part 10 specifies that trunk sewers are to be substantially completed in the Orleans and Kanata urban centres before any Regional expenditure on trunk sewers for the south urban centre.

02.1.6.0 00( ) (Point #11)
Paragraph 6 should be clarified to ensure servicing potential (sewer, water, roads and transit) is available to the east urban community and west urban community.

This paragraph has not been amended in the revised Official Plan adopted by Regional Council, but Policy 1 in Part 10 specifies that trunk sewers are to be substantially completed in the Orleans and Kanata urban centres before any Regional expenditure on trunk sewers for the south urban centre. Priority for water system improvements is not established because money can be generated through the water rate to provide for increased water system capacity as required. In Part 11 first priority transitway improvements include stations in the town centres of the urban centres; second priority are the transitway extensions to Orleans and Kanata and third priority is the extension(s) to the south urban centre. Priorities for road improvements are not established in the Plan.

02.1.6.0 10( ) (Points #12 & #13)
11 Road and transit requirements to the east urban community should be included in these objectives.

Objective 10 addresses meeting the water and sewer service needs of the desired development pattern. The point of Objective 11 is to extend water mains and trunk sewers so that an adequate supply of serviced residential land is available (defined as a minimum of 10 years supply). Without these piped services urban development cannot proceed. Urban development can and does happen, however, in advance of investments in transportation infrastructure. Objective 12 in Section 2.1.7 addresses meeting the transportation requirements of new development.

02.1.7.0 00( ) (Point #14)
Paragraph 1 should be clarified to stipulate the need to upgrade the transportation system to service both east urban community and west urban community.

Paragraph 1 of Section 2.1.7 of the Official Plan adopted by Regional Council is a general discussion of regional transportation responsibilities and the factors which influence the transportation strategy. It does not address the specific circumstances of the current situation.

02.1.7.0 00( )

(Point #15)
Paragraphs 12 and 13 should be amended to include a statement to the effect that the east urban community and west urban community should receive priority for transportation improvements.

Paragraphs 12 and 13 in Section 2.1.7 of the Official Plan adopted by Regional Council mention the congestion of east-west traffic movements as a key problem and the need for road system improvements to serve the urban centres. However, they do not establish a priority for the east and west urban centres. The provision of transportation facilities should be on the basis of need in each corridor and the availability of money to do the work. Since the development of traffic demand is dependent upon a variety of factors not easily predicted (e.g. vehicle occupancy, transit share) road improvements have not been priorized.

02.1.7.0 00( )

(Point #16)
Support for paragraph 15, i.e. the outer ring road link between Highways 416 and 417.

A major road link connecting Highways 416 and 417 south of the greenbelt is included in the revised Official Plan adopted by Council.

02.1.7.0 00( )

(Point #17)
Paragraph 16 should be amended to priorize the development of employment and integrated transit stations with the east urban community and west urban community town centres receiving top priority.

The Official Plan adopted by Regional Council does not establish priorities among the three urban centres for the development of transitway stations in their town centres.

02.2.0.0 02( )

(Point #18)
That Stage 2 lands surrounding the east urban community and west urban community should be designated, and that Stage 2 lands for the east urban community should encompass lands in both Gloucester and Cumberland and be subject to comprehensive planning studies similar to that provided in policy 3 for the south urban community.

In the Official Plan adopted by Regional Council there is no distinction between Stage 1 and Stage 2 lands. There has been some expansion to the boundaries of both urban centres, but not at the scale requested by this brief. The land designated in the Official Plan is sufficient for projected requirements in 2011 (with a surplus for orderly market operation of more than ten years additional requirement). The question of expansion to the boundaries of the East Urban Centre (in both Gloucester and Cumberland) is still under review as a result of a proposal by the Township of Cumberland which Council referred to Planning Committee.

02.2.0.0 04( )

(Point #19)
It is recommended that the maximum number of households be increased from 30,000 to 40,000 in Orleans.

The Official Plan adopted by Regional Council provides for a minimum of 25,000 and a maximum of 33,000 dwelling units in the Orleans urban

centre. Regional Council referred to Planning Committee a request to increase the maximum to 40,000.

02.2.0.0 06( ) (Point #20)
The word "may" should be deleted and the word "will" be substituted.

The word "may" is used in the policy adopted by Regional Council. The intent of the policy is to draw a distinction between areas where municipal piped services may be provided and those areas where the extension of municipal piped services is not permitted. Use of the word "will" would not convey this meaning.

03.1.3.2 06( ) (Points #21 & #22)
07 It is recommended these policies be deleted.

The revised Official Plan, adopted by Regional Council retained the above-noted policies in Section 3.1.3.2, Primary Employment Centres. Pedestrian-oriented development is essential to realizing the full potential of the transitway system. Policy 6 deals with local official plans and plans of subdivision for which the Region is the delegated approving authority and which are required by the Planning Act, 1983 to conform with or have regard to the Regional Official Plan. Policy 7 deals with site plan approvals where local municipalities are the approving authorities. Policy 7 is worded to give explicit recognition to the local municipal jurisdiction.

03.2.3.0 00( ) (Point #23)
Reference permitting floor space use for community facilities and/or offices should be deleted.

The discussion contained in Section 3.2.3 of the Official Plan explains how the gross leasable area of shopping centres will be determined when these centres are part of a larger mixed use development. Other comments indicated the need for this clarification. It remains in the Official Plan adopted by Regional Council.

03.2.3.1 04( ) (Point #24)
It is recommended that the word "or" be deleted and the word "and" be substituted so that it reads ..."exists in both Kanata Town Centre and the Orleans Town Centre".

The Official Plan adopted by Regional Council provides for a review of the size limits of Regional Shopping Centres inside the greenbelt when a Regional Shopping Centre exists in either the Kanata Town Centre "or" the Orleans Town Centre. This wording means that a review is triggered by development of a Regional Shopping Centre in one of the two town centres. Use of "and" would delay a review until both town centres had Regional Shopping Centres. This is considered too restrictive as none of the Regional Shopping Centres inside the greenbelt strongly affect both the Kanata and Orleans urban centres.

03.3.2.0 01( ) (Point #25)
It is recommended that hospitals and recreation centres be deleted.

The official plan adopted by Regional Council includes hospitals and major recreation

facilities as Major Community Facilities. All the hospitals in Ottawa-Carleton serve the residents of more than one area municipality; their location is appropriately decided by the Region. The only recreation facility considered "major" and hence designated on Schedule B of the official plan is Lansdowne Park, the site of the Central Canada Exhibition. A Canadian Football League team uses the stadium there and a Junior A hockey team plays in the Civic Centre. The recreation centres of area municipalities, e.g. Nepean Sportsplex, are not designated.

03.3.3.0 02(d)

(Point #26)
Clarification is requested on regional funding for major community facilities.

The reference to regional funding of major community facilities has been deleted from the official plan adopted by Regional Council However, the regional municipality contributes to the capital costs of hospitals.

03.4.2.0 02( )

(Point #27)
This section should indicate that the transportation system should be constructed with due regard to minimizing cost, but also to providing the highest and best possible service.

The objective concerning cost minimization is qualified by the words "consistent with overall benefit". This provides for consideration of service levels and other factors.

03.4.3.0 01(a)

(Point #28)
Clarification on what is meant by an aggregation of 2,000 jobs be provided and examples be given of why it needs to be addressed at Regional level.

In the revised official plan adopted by Regional Council, the wording has been changed to "discrete clusters of contiguous non-residential uses". This wording makes it clearer that there is no intent to set a limit on the number of such aggregations/discrete clusters in areas designated General Urban Area (by either area municipality, urban centre or any other basis). Examples of these discrete clusters include Elmvale Shopping Centre and the adjoining medical office building, the strip of restaurants and retail uses along Somerset Street, and Lincoln Heights Galleria and the adjoining commercial uses. It is judged that clusters above 2,000 jobs will be destinations for a large number of people, so that considerations of regional road access and transit service become increasingly important. Such clusters should be considered for designation as Secondary Employment Centres in local official plans and it is desirable that these be located on the transitway.

04.1.0.0 00( )

(Point #29)
Paragraph 6. Clarification on why 3,500 additional habitants could generate demand for additional lane of road is required.

This information may be found in Technical Report Task Z published in November 1985.

04.2.1.0 00( )

(Point #30)
Clarification is requested whether existing village boundaries remain subject to existing approval procedures.

The requirement for village private services studies applies only if the boundary is to be expanded or the potential number of dwelling units to be increased.

04.2.2.0 00( )

(Point #31)
The Township supports the concept that village expansion be based on hydrogeology studies.

This is incorporated in the Plan.

04.2.2.0 10( )

(Point #32)
The Region should clarify its intent with respect to existing village boundaries.

Private services studies are not required if village boundaries are not to be expanded or if the potential number of dwelling units is not to be increased.

04.2.3.0 17( )

(Point #33)
The minimum lot size for this policy be reduced to 5 hectares from 10 hectares.

The 10 hectares was chosen having regard to a size of a lot appropriate for market gardening or hobby farming, where for this type of operation it would be unrealistic to require the lot to be wooded.

05.1.3.2 03( )
04

(Points #34 & #35)
These policies should be amended to reflect existing Township policy which allows a retirement lot for a person who has worked on a farm for 10 years but does not allow severances for farm help. The latter situation is handled by a policy which provides for a second farm dwelling on an existing farm operation.

A retirement lot should only be granted to those who have committed the majority of a normal working life to farming. The policy adopted by Regional Council requires the farmer to have worked on a farm in Ontario for at least 20 years. Local municipalities may be more restrictive than the regional official plan concerning farm help severances.

05.1.3.3 06( )

(Point #36)
The Township has designated some areas, e.g. the French Hill area for country lot development. These should be permitted to be maintained.

In the official plan adopted by Regional Council, the French Hill area and the Bearbrook Golf Course area are designated General Rural Area, which permits country lot development.

05.1.3.3 08( )

(Point #37)
In these areas the Township permits lot sizes of 2 hectares and the lot size permitted by policy 8 should be reduced to allow this.

The lot size permitted by Policy 8 has been reduced to 2 hectares.

05.1.3.4 00( )

(Point #38)
Clarification is requested on why such a committee is necessary.

All reference to the Agricultural Advisory Committee has been deleted.

05.2.3.3 00( ) A (Point #39)
This section should permit the designation of class 2 areas and schedule A specifically should be amended to designate the Canaan Hill deposit.

The Canaan Hill deposit has been designated Mineral Resource Area in the official plan adopted by Regional Council.

05.3.0.0 00( ) A (Point #40)
Concern expressed about the designation of a site as recreation area. The Region is requested to clarify.

This site is the MacSkimming Natural Science School owned by the Ottawa Board of Education.

11.2.2.0 00( ) (Point #41)
The Blackburn Hamlet by-pass extension should be included under Tier 1 road improvements.

There is no "tiering" of road improvements in the official plan adopted by Regional Council. Council will determine the priority of improvements to the regional road system in its five-year capital budget forecast in the context of monitoring reports and other indicators of need.

00.0.0.0 00( ) AB (Point #42)
The triangle of land south of Innes Road north of the Hydro right-of-way should be added to the urban area.

This land has been added to the urban area.

Brief #88: Tanglewood Ottawa Limited

00.0.0.0 00( ) AB (Point #01)
South 1/2 of lot 22, conc. 5, City of Gloucester. A request to include lot 22 in the village of Leitrim as an urban area because the mineral aggregate found on the land is not suitable for extraction. Sanitary sewers have the capacity to support industrial and commercial development. The local official plan states that industrial and commercial development should occur around existing villages and a site plan is being prepared for the area.

This land has not been included in the Leitrim urban area; it is designated General Rural Area and Mineral Resource Area.

Brief #89: Mrs. M. Sinha, Rideau Front Property Owners

02.1.3.0 04( ) (Point #01)
Support for south urban community because the Region cannot go on growing east and west like a sausage, cannot expand to the north, therefore growth must take place in the south (among other things).

The revised Official Plan adopted by Regional Council contains the strategy of diverting some growth from an east-west axis to the south urban centre.

Brief #90: Dr. R. Sinha

02.2.0.0 02( ) (Point #01)
Does not quarrel with the expansion of Barrhaven westwards. Concern with allowing growth in Nepean south of the Jock River.

The amount of urban development in Nepean south of the Jock River will be determined by the amendment to regional official plan for the south urban centre required by Policy 3 of Part 2 of the official plan adopted by Regional Council.

Brief #91: Mrs. Grace Blackburn, Action Alta Vista Parkway

00.0.0.0 00( ) C1 (Point #01)
Support for the Alta Vista Parkway.

The Alta Vista Parkway is included in the official plan adopted by Regional Council.

11.2.2.0 00( ) (Point #02)
Alta Vista Parkway should be a Tier 1 rather than a Tier 2 road priority.

There is no "tiering" of road improvements in the official plan adopted by Regional Council. Council will determine the priority of improvements to the regional road system in its five-year capital budget forecast in the context of monitoring reports and other indicators of need.

00.0.0.0 00( ) E (Point #03)
A transitway should be built in the Alta Vista Parkway corridor.

Regional Council decided in the late 1970s that the Southeast Transitway should not be in the Alta Vista Parkway Corridor.

Brief #92: Mr. Dan Perley, West Carleton Ratepayers Association

02.1.1.0 00( ) (Point #01)
The plan should not maintain a 90/10 urban/rural incremental residential development ratio.

Neither the May 1987 draft version nor the official plan adopted by Regional Council contain either an objective or policy restraining rural residential development to 10% of regional residential development. A 90/10 urban/rural split is used only as an assumption for purposes of projecting urban land requirements.

04.1.0.0 00( ) (Point #02)
Objective 2 (provision to live in a rural environment) should become objective 1 because it is of higher priority. The Region should provide for between 15% and 20% of total new residential units in the rural area. A rural planning group should be established with representation from Regional Council, the Planning Department and local Planning Departments and Councils and citizen representation.

All objectives are treated equally and the numbering does not imply a ranking. The assumption that approximately 10% of new dwelling units will be in the rural area is based on past trends and has not been set as a policy. Whenever the Planning Department initiates a study in the rural area it involves all interest groups at the outset. It is not seen necessary to establish a standing group for rural planning matters.

04.2.1.0 04( ) (Point #03)
They disagree that severances with access to regional roads should be curtailed.

The intent is not to totally ban new severances with frontage on a regional road but to prevent new strips of development from being created.

05.1.3.1 01( ) (Point #04)
This policy should provide for the farmer to have a house.

A policy has been added to permit a house to be built on a lot of record.

05.1.3.2 03( ) (Point #05)
This policy should provide for a farm retirement lot and for a farm help lot.

Provision for both has been made.

10.1.2.0 09( ) (Point #06)
Suggested that the onus for providing evidence of sufficient quantity of potable water should be placed on the person seeking a severance through the presentation of a well driller's test result. Farmers should be exempted from this but where an exemption is granted, the farmer should sign a binding agreement registered on title not to sell the property unless acceptable water is found thereon.

It is not the intent of the Regional Plan to prescribe which of the parties involved has to provide the evidence.

11.2.0.0 00( ) (Point #07)
Rural roads should be built with single lane collectors on each side where required. The extra lanes would allow higher speeds on regional roads, turn-outs onto the regional road, easier passage for bicycles and pedestrians, easier snow removal. Carp Road, Regional Road 5, should be widened if Carp is to grow by 3,500 people.

Intersections and sections of roadway are upgraded to meet the traffic requirements. Such upgradings are on a priority basis and are updated at budget time each year.

11.2.2.0 00( ) (Point #09)
417 should be widened from Acres Road to Woodroffe Avenue.

The Ministry of Transportation of Ontario (MTO) proposes to widen Highway 417 to six lanes between Acres Road and Woodroffe in conjunction with the construction of Highway 416.

11.2.2.0 00( ) (Point #10)
417 should be extended up the Ottawa Valley.

The extension of Highway 417 proposed is a matter for MTO and is outside of the regional official plan.

11.4.1.0 00( ) (Point #11)
Reference should be made to the need for Park and Ride facilities in the Kanata area.

Reference has been added to park and ride facilities, but not specifically in Kanata. Specific references to current needs may quickly become outdated. Every effort is being made to have a park and ride facility in Kanata in the near future.

11.4.2.0 00( ) (Point #12)
Extensions of the transitway to Kanata and Orleans should have a higher priority than those for the south urban community.

Policy 20 of Part 11 of the official plan adopted by Regional Council establishes extensions of the transitway to Orleans and Kanata as a second priority and extension to the south urban centre as a third priority.

11.2.0.0 00( ) (Point #13)
Rural residents do not receive a fair deal when they travel downtown. There are too few parking spaces which are highly-priced; there are too many "no left turn" signs; one cannot refeed parking meters.

Parking is not a Regional matter - other than identifying the parking spaces along regional roads.

Brief #93: Ms. Vicki Mason, Taxpayers Association of Ottawa-Carleton

02.2.0.0 02( ) (Point #01)
Concern that the south urban centre is on leda clay and good agricultural land.

It is acknowledged that the south urban centre is on good agricultural land. However, when all factors are considered, it is judged to be the best location for additional urban land. Good agricultural soils predominate in most of lands immediately outside the greenbelt.
The 1976 Morton, Dodds report points out that Leda Clay underlies much of Ottawa-Carleton. However, the available evidence indicates that the Leda Clay in the south urban centre has significantly better strength and compressibility characteristics and hence poses fewer problems than at most other potential development sites. The report concluded that there are no constraints to the construction of all but the heaviest types of structures.

02.2.0.0 03(d) (Point #02)
Support for the Outer Ring Road.

The major road between Highways 416 and 417 south of the greenbelt is included in the Official Plan adopted by Regional Council.

00.0.0.0 00( ) A (Point #03)
Changes to natural environment area designation should be for a substantial reason, not only to appease developers. Concerned that we should save our wetlands.

Amendment 56 (for the land along Moodie Drive south of the greenbelt) was approved on the understanding that the City of Nepean would ensure that development would not adversely affect Stoney Swamp. It is understood that Nepean is carrying out a drainage study.

Brief #94: Mr. Paul Webber, Bell, Baker (for Fine's Flowers Ltd.)

02.2.0.0 03( ) AB (Point #01)
Lots 27-30, Conc. 1 &2, City of Gloucester
Would like the study referred to in policy 3 to include an expanded general urban area which includes all the lands in the City of Gloucester bounded by the Rideau River, Leitrim Road Albion Road and Regional Road 8.

The general location of the study area for the south urban centre in Gloucester already encompasses 2,230 hectares. Addition of lands from Rideau Road south to Regional Road 8 as requested would add another approximately 2,500 hectares. While at this stage, land in that general area will not be ruled out from consideration, the very large amount of land potentially available for urban development makes it unlikely that this land will be included in the urban area.

Brief #95: Mr. Douglas Kelly, Soloway, Wright et.al. (for Campeau Corporation)

03.2.3.1 03( ) (Point #01)
Market study in support of South Keys shopping centre being permitted to go to 70,000 square metres.

The Official Plan adopted by Regional Council establishes a gross leasable area ceiling of 70,000 sq.m. for South Keys shopping centre.

Brief #96: Mr. Tom Smart, Ontario Ministry of Municipal Affairs

06.2.6.0 12( ) (Point #01)
Support.

The policy on group homes is included in the Plan adopted by Council.

06.2.5.0 11( ) (Point #02)
Support.

The condominium conversion policy is included in the Plan adopted by Council with a slight modification to permit exceptions for heritage structures.

03.1.3.1 02( ) (Point #03)
Support.

The Official Plan adopted by Regional Council continues to call for cooperative planning by the Region, the National Capital Commission and the City of Ottawa for the future development of the Central Area.

11.2.0.0 00( ) (Point #04)
The Ministry is available to assist all parties in resolving apparent conflicts regarding certain roads on federal land such as Ottawa River Parkway east and Hunt Club Road extension.

This offer has been noted.

01.7.2.0 04( ) (Point #05)
This policy is appropriate, however the second sentence should be either clarified or deleted. Design details are not normally handled in secondary plans but are rather dealt with under site plan control policies.

The second sentence was deleted from this policy in the revised official plan adopted by Regional Council.

02.2.0.0 03( ) (Point #06)
Clarification is requested on why the study permitted by policy 3 is larger than the area included in policy 2 and which lands precisely would be included in Stage 1 lands and which would be affected by the planning study.

The May 1987 draft official plan made a distinction between Stage 1 lands and Stage 2 lands in

the south urban centre. The Stage 1 lands were in Nepean north of the Jock River and were approved for immediate development subject to policies elsewhere in the Plan. Policy 3 in the May 1987 draft Plan called for a study to determine appropriate policies for development of the south urban centre as a whole, both Stage 1 and Stage 2. This was intended to ensure that the development of Stage 1 took place within a framework that was compatible with the eventual development of the entire urban centre.
The official plan adopted by Regional Council no longer makes a distinction between Stage 1 and Stage 2 lands. Policy 3 no longer refers to a planning study. However, it requires an amendment to the regional official plan to establish policies for the south urban centre at a similar level of detail to the regional policies for the Kanata and Orleans urban centres, before urban development may proceed.

07.2.3.0 00( ) (Point #07)
Reference in this section to Ministry of Municipal Affairs should be changed to Province of Ontario.

The Ministry of Municipal Affairs is the responsible agency.

07.2.3.0 00( ) (Point #08)
Provincial policy requires noise attenuation between NEF/NEP 28 and 35, not NEF 30 and 35.

Policy 13 covers this matter as it adopts provincial policy.

07.2.3.0 13( ) (Point #09)
Provincial policy is to use the 35 NEF/NEP value in restricting residential development. The Ministry has no concerns in the Region using this more restrictive value.

The more restrictive value of NEF/NEP 30 has been deleted.

07.2.3.0 16( ) (Point #10)
A rewording is suggested to delete reference to noise level in line 5 as follows "notwithstanding policy 13, local official plans, plans of subdivision, plans of condominium and severances which permit residential development above NEF/NEP 35 inside the greenbelt may be approved, if it is demonstrated that the site's specific natural topography provides sufficient attenuation of ground based noise to reduce the NEF/NEP values for the site to less than 35 when all other pertinent criteria involved in the calculation of the NEF/NEP values have been included".

Agree. This has been reworded.

00.0.0.0 00( ) G (Point #11)
It is not clear whether the generalized contour illustrates all lands covered by both the NEF and NEP 28 contour.

The area designated on Schedule G of the Regional Plan as "Airport Noise Zone" includes both the 28 NEF and 28 NEP contours.

07.2.3.0 00( ) (Point #12)
The policy is not clear on whether all road

noise will be included, nor does it include other noise sources such as industry.

It includes all road, transitway and rail noise. There are no similar provincial policies dealing with industrial noise and therefore no basis for including criteria in the Regional Official Plan. This is a matter which local municipalities may want to consider in regard to compatibility between land uses.

07.2.3.0 19( ) (Point #13)
Policy 19 only refers to plans of subdivision. The Ministry feels all planning applications should be subject to noise policies.

The text recognizes that local municipalities have a responsibility when it comes to site plans; at the plan of condominium stage it is often too late to incorporate noise protection features. For this reason the policies relate only to plans of subdivision.

07.2.3.0 19( ) (Point #14)
This policy should be amended to include reference to 70 dBA as the "attenuated outdoor noise level".

This has been done.

Brief #97: Mr. R.S. Binnie, Transport Canada Airport Authority Group

07.2.3.0 13( ) (Points #01 to #04)
14 No objection to section 7.2.3 re airport noise.
15
16

The approach has been simplified to reflect provincial policy for development between NEF/NEP 30 and NEF/NEP 35. This changes policy 13 and deletes policy 15 of the draft plan. There is no longer a distinction between inside and outside the greenbelt in policy 16. New policy 17 includes Transport Canada among the agencies who will review the noise studies referred to in policy 16.

Brief #98: Mr. William D. Crompton, Hampton-Iona Community Group

00.0.0.0 00( ) C1 (Point #01)
Does not support the Westboro community association that the extension of Kirkwood Avenue is the solution to the problems of traffic in the community.

The Kirkwood Avenue extension is included in the official plan adopted by Regional Council. This project is considered necessary to carry future traffic volumes in this area. The need (and timing) for the extension is primarily dependent on the timing of high density development on lands north of Scott Street.

Brief #99: Mr. M.J. Bacon, Proctor & Redfern Group (for M. Holitzner Limited)

05.4.0.0 02(g) A (Point #01)
Lot 10, conc. 2, Kanata. 200 acres designated marginal resource (restricted) would like to develop part of the site for housing while preserving a large area free from development. In order to do this, extension of piped water supply will be required.

The objective for Marginal Resource Areas (Restricted) is that they be protected in their natural state because of their environmental value. To extend a water pipe into these areas to facilitate development would be contrary to

this objective and also contrary to Section 24 of the Planning Act concerning public works. The official plan permits the developer to undertake an environmental impact study and as a first step he should do this. If this demonstrates the development can proceed subject to certain conditions, it should proceed like any other rural development on the basis of private services. However, regardless of the outcome of the environmental impact study, staff do not recommend any change in the policy of not

extending services beyond the urban areas to serve rural developments. Such development should depend, among other things, on there being an adequate quantity and quality of groundwater.

Brief #100: Mr. D. Kennedy, Tartan Development Corporation

00.0.0.0 00( ) AB (Point #01)

320 acre parcel in the Leitrim area. It is requested that it be designated urban. The village of Leitrim should be expanded immediately for 10,000 people. In the long term, the village should be expanded to include the land bounded by Leitrim Road, Albion Road, Rideau Road, and the drainage area which lies just east of Bank Street. The initial expansion can be serviced by the sewer in Conroy Road. The addition of 10,000 people will not require improvements to the existing road networks. It has good access to the South Keys transit terminal; it does not have adverse affect on agricultural land. Major trunk services can be provided immediately at reasonable cost for the 10,000 population.

The official plan adopted by Regional Council designates an urban area in the vicinity of Leitrim, including this parcel. Development up to a maximum of 3,200 dwelling units (i.e. approximately 10,000 people) is permitted.

00.0.0.0 00( ) AB (Point #02)

There is an opportunity to work out an agreement on financing the necessary works resulting in developer constributions over and above the normal lot levies.

The official plan states that Regional Council shall not incur costs for infrastructure relating to development in Leitrim (policy 9, Part 2).

Brief #101: Mrs. Barbara McGee

00.0.0.0 00( ) AB (Point #01)

Refer to brief 6, originally a 30 acre parcel, the north 1/4 of the east 1/2 of lot 29, formerly Township of Goulbourn now City of Kanata. After expropriation by MVCA 24 acres front on Highway 7, and 2 acres have no access to Highway 7. The land is not suitable for agriculture. Difficulties in carrying on agriculture because of trespass causing damage to crops and fences. If the Council wishes to maintain a greenbelt buffer between Kanata and Stittsville, they should buy the land. The alternative is to designate it for urban purposes.

The land east of the Carp River has been included in the urban area. The land west of the Carp River is designated Agricultural Resource. This land has to be considered in the context of all the land between Kanata and

Stittsville. It is acknowledged that agricultural operations next to any urban area may suffer from intrusions but this is not reason enough to redesignate such land or for it to be publicly acquired. Having regard to the need to establish the south urban centre, the transportation facilities potentially available to service the western part of the urban area and the overall supply of vacant urban land, this area is not designated for urban development. As prime farm land which is part of an area of contiguous farming along the Carp Valley which extends into West Carleton, it is designated Agricultural Resource.

Brief #102: Mr. Allan R. Gregory

03.2.3.1 03( ) (Point #01)
[An addendum to brief 22] It raises the question of the exact size of the Carlingwood shopping centre and recommends that policy 3 should express the Carlingwood shopping centre "as built" or "existing", rather than "50,000 square metres".

A permitted gross leasable area (GLA) is not established for Carlingwood Shopping Centre in the Official Plan adopted by Regional Council. This matter is under study by the City of Ottawa. Trilea Centres Inc. has agreed not to submit any site plan proposal for a period of eighteen months while the City completes its study.

Brief #103: Mr. Tom Smart, Ontario Ministry of Municipal Affairs

00.0.0.0 00( ) (Point #01)
[Letter transmitting responses of other provincial ministries].

Brief #104: Mr. W.D. Buchanan, Winter Buchanan Associates (for Edward Coates)

00.0.0.0 00( ) AB (Point #01)
Land in the village of Stittsville is proposed to be designated extensive employment area and it is requested that it be designated general urban area to permit residential development.

This has been changed to General Urban Area.

Brief #105: Ms. Marion Seymour , Marion Seymour, Consultant

00.0.0.0 00( ) A (Point #01)
The northeast corner of regional roads 8 and 19 in the City of Gloucester. A request to change the designation from agricultural resource (river corridor) to general rural area (river corridor) to enable a commercial development on the land, because it is unreasonable to place more restrictions on development east of regional road 19 because of the proximity of the river than on the lands adjacent to the river. The three corners of this intersection are already committed to commercial development; the fourth corner should therefore be committed to development and the only viable option is commercial.

This has been changed as requested.

Brief #106: Ms. Margo Teasdale, Ontario Ministry of Citizenship and Culture - Heritage Branch

09.3.0.0 00( ) (Point #01)
The Ministry's concerns have been included.

The policies are incorporated almost unchanged.

11.2.4.0 00( ) (Point #02)
This section should provide some provision for the protection of heritage buildings in areas subject to road widening policies.

The road widening policies are implemented through the site plan approval process. They have no effect unless there is a (re)development application, in which case any impact on heritage buildings is more likely to stem from the (re)development application than from the road widening policies.

11.2.4.0 07(d) (Point #03)
Unequal widenings should also be required where heritage features might be adversely affected by widenings.

The official plan adopted by Regional Council does not provide for unequal widenings where heritage features might be adversely affected.

09.3.0.0 00( ) (Point #04)
The region may want to consider assuming a co-ordinating role for heritage matters.

The Region does not see itself as a lead agency in heritage. Any role in co-ordination would have to be requested by other interested agencies and then carefully considered.

09.3.0.0 00( ) (Point #05)
Areas in the region without LACACs include the City of Kanata and the Townships of West Carleton and Osgoode. These areas should be encouraged to organize LACACs.

This should be left to the local Councils.

Brief #107: Ms. Lynda Newman, Ontario Ministry of Housing

06.2.5.0 11( ) (Point #01)
No objections or suggestions for additions to Section 6.2.5.

The policy on condominium conversion is included in the Plan adopted by Council, but now permits exceptions for heritage buildings.

Brief #108: Mr. Bob Avery & Mrs. Ghislaine Brunet

00.0.0.0 00( ) A (Point #01)
Lots 12, 13, 14 conc. 1, lots 12 and 13 conc. 2 and lot 12 conc.3 Township of Cumberland. The first point is concern about the possible designation of land now designated agricultural resource as mineral resource for quarry operations.

In the revised official plan adopted by Regional Council, the Canaan Hill area has been changed to Mineral Resource Area, which reflects the designation in the Cumberland Official Plan.

05.1.3.1 01(f) (Point #02)
Only areas designated mineral resource area by the region should be allowed to have quarries.

In Agricultural Resource areas quarries are restricted to pockets of poor soils. The Mineral Resource Area designation in the regional official plan is intended to protect the most significant mineral deposits. However other deposits may also be suitable for economic extraction. For this reason the official plan adopted by Regional Council also permits mineral extraction in the General Rural Area

and Agricultural Resources designations (subject to policies in local official plans).

Brief #109: Mr. Barry Wellar, Carlingwood Action Committee

03.2.3.1 03( ) (Point #01)
Carlingwood should be changed to Carlingwood/ Fairlawn and "50,000 square meters" should be changed to "existing".

Carlingwood Shopping Centre is designated as a Regional Shopping Centre on Schedule B of the Region's revised Official Plan. Fairlawn Plaza is, in Section 3.2.3.2, a Community Shopping Centre. It would not be appropriate to treat Fairlawn Plaza differently from other Community Shopping Centres simply because it is located adjacent to a Regional Shopping Centre. Section 3.2.3.1 of the Region's revised Official Plan does not establish a gross leasable area ceiling for Carlingwood Shopping Centre. The City of Ottawa is doing a zoning review. Trilea Centres Inc. has agreed not to submit any site plan proposal for a period of eighteen months while the City completes its study. When When study results are available, Regional Council will establish a limit for Carlingwood.

02.1.7.0 00( ) (Point #02)
Support the first paragraph.

This paragraph is unchanged in the Official Plan adopted by Regional Council.

02.1.7.0 00( ) (Point #03)
Support the 12th paragraph.

This paragraph is unchanged in the Official Plan adopted by Regional Council.

03.2.3.1 00( ) (Point #04)
Concerned that the shortfall in parking spaces at Carlingwood/Fairlawn result in there being no development potential remaining.

The City of Ottawa through its zoning by-law establishes and maintains parking standards. An appropriate gross leasable area ceiling for Carlingwood Shopping Centre in the Region's revised Official Plan will not be established until the City of Ottawa has completed traffic studies.

03.2.3.1 00( ) (Point #05)
Concerned about the safety of traffic in the Carlingwood/Fairlawn area.

The 1986 traffic accident rates for Regional road intersections in the vicinity of Carlingwood Shopping Centre and Fairlawn Plaza range from 0.55 to 0.82 accidents per million vehicles. The overall traffic accident rate average for Regional road intersections experiencing similar volumes is 0.78 accidents per million vehicles. The data on which the Regional traffic accident rate is based include vehicles, property and persons. Given these recent statistics the Regional road system in the vicinity of Carlingwood Shopping Centre and Fairlawn Plaza does not warrant immediate safety-related upgrades.

03.2.3.1 00( ) (Point #06)
Up to 30% of vehicle trips are made on local streets in the Carlingwood/Fairlawn area

because of congestion on Carling and Woodroffe.

The 1987 Regional traffic counts indicate that the Regional road system in the vicinity of Carlingwood Shopping Centre and Fairlawn Plaza is functioning at a high enough level of service during the PM peak hour so as not to warrant immediate capacity upgrades. The PM peak hour is the period of highest traffic volume in the vicinity of Carlingwood Shopping Centre and Fairlawn Plaza.

03.2.3.1 00( ) (Point #07)
Commercial strip development on Carling Avenue makes it laughable to contemplate efficient high frequency transit service along Carling Avenue.

Efficient all day high frequency transit service is provided along Carling Avenue.

Brief #110: Mrs. Helen Johansen

03.2.3.1 00( ) (Point #01)
Concern about traffic safety in the Carlingwood/ Fairlawn Shopping Centre Area because of the large number of facilities catering to children, e.g. schools and library, and for senior citizens living in the area.

The 1986 traffic accident rates for Regional road intersections in the vicinity of Carlingwood Shopping Centre and Fairlawn Plaza range from 0.55 to 0.82 accidents per million vehicles. The overall Regional traffic accident rate average for Regional road intersections experiencing similar volumes is 0.78 accidents per million vehicles. The data on which the Regional traffic accident rate is based include vehicles, property and persons. Given these recent statistics the Regional road system in the vicinity of Carlingwood Shopping Centre and Fairlawn Plaza does not warrant immediate safety-related upgrades.

Brief #111: Mr. H.J. Martin, Limebank Holdings

00.0.0.0 00( ) AB (Point #01)
Lot 25 concession 2 Rideau Front City of Gloucester 217 acres immediately north of Rideau Road and east of Limebank Road. Would like to see the land included in the south urban centre.

While this land will not be ruled out for inclusion in the south urban centre, the very large amount of land potentially available for urban development (2,230 hectares in Rideau Ridge alone) makes it unlikely that this land will be included in the urban area.

00.0.0.0 00( ) AB (Point #02)
Support City of Gloucester's Amendment 11.

The official plan adopted by Regional Council includes provision for a portion of the South Urban Centre in Gloucester. Further planning work is being done by the Cities of Nepean and Gloucester, which will be followed by an amendment to the new regional official to establish policies for this urban centre at a similar level of detail to the policies for the West and East Urban Centres, as well as amendments to the Nepean and Gloucester official plan. It is not known at this time how closely the amendment to Gloucester's official plan will resemble Amendment 11.

Brief #112: Ms. Janet Bradley, Soloway, Wright, et. al. (for Famlit Investments et.al.)

00.0.0.0 00( ) AB (Point #01)
Lot 21 Conc. 4 City of Gloucester within the Leitrim growth area as proposed by the City of Gloucester. Would like to be designated either general urban area or serviced village, because services are already in place and very little expenditure would be required for development to proceed.

In the revised official plan adopted by Regional Council an urban area of approximately 500 ha is designated in the vicinity of Leitrim. Lot 21, conc. 4 however, is not included in this urban area; it is designated General Rural.

Brief #113: Ms. Janet Bradley, Soloway, Wright, et. al. (for Gib Patterson)

00.0.0.0 00( ) AB (Point #01)
Lot 22 conc. 4 City of Gloucester. The lands are within the Leitrim growth area. Would like to be designated general urban area or serviced village because services are already in place and very little expenditure would be required.

In the revised official plan adopted by Regional Council an urban area of approximately 500 ha is designated in the vicinity of Leitrim. Lot 22, conc. 4 however, is not included in this urban area; it is designated General Rural.

Brief #114: Ms. Janet Bradley, Soloway, Wright, et. al. (for Cave Investments)

00.0.0.0 00( ) A (Point #01)
Part of Lot 21 conc. 1 Township of Rideau. It is an abandoned gravel pit adjacent to the Village of Kars. The land appears to be designated as agricultural resource. It has not been farmed for many years. It has no capacity as a gravel pit. They would like to be designated either general rural area or village.

This land is part of the village of Kars as designated in the Township of Rideau Official Plan.

00.0.0.0 00( ) A (Point #02)
Would like confirmation that the dot indicating the Village of Kars can be interpreted generally so that the Regional Planning Department can consider the land within the Village designation.

The dot has been interpreted when the village plan for Kars was approved.

Brief #115: Ms. Janet Bradley, Soloway, Wright, et. al. (for Arnon Development Corporation)

00.0.0.0 00( ) B (Point #01)
18-acre parcel on Baseline Road west of Merivale known as Meriline Court. Would like confirmation that the designation of secondary employment centre being proposed at Maitland and Baseline could be interpreted to include these lands.

The Secondary Employment Centre designation at Maitland and Baseline in the May 1987 draft official plan could be interpreted to include this property. However, the official plan adopted by Regional Council gives area municipalities the responsibility of designating Secondary Employment Centres in their local official plans, subject to criteria established in the Region's official plan. As

such, the City of Ottawa will ultimately decide the location and extent of a Secondary Employment Centre in this vicinity.

Brief #116: Mr. John H. Sellers, Ontario Ministry of Natural Resources

00.0.0.0 00( ) A (Point #01)
A number of existing licensed pits and quarries occur outside the mineral resource areas.

Agree. The Regional Plan designates only the major deposits.

00.0.0.0 00( ) G (Point #02)
The Ministry is responsible for flood plain concerns where no conservation authority exists.

This is stated in Section 7.2.1.

05.1.3.1 01(g) (Point #03)
Request that quarries also be added to this section as a permitted use.

In Agricultural Resource areas quarries are restricted to pockets of poor soils. There is so much limestone available in the region that there is no need to take prime agricultural land out of production for what would amount to many years.

05.2.6.0 00( ) (Point #04)
Responsibility for Silica sands is now administered by the Ministry of Northern Development and Mines.

This has been corrected.

04.2.3.0 13( ) (Points #05 & #06)
14 Reference should be made to the fact that pits and quarries are permitted in general rural areas.

They are covered by the term "uses related to local resources" in policy 14.

05.2.5.0 00( ) (Point #07)
The heading should read mineral resource areas not marginal resource areas.

This correction has been made.

05.2.7.0 06( ) (Point #08)
The Ministry of Natural Resources should be added to this policy.

This has been done.

05.2.7.0 07( ) (Point #09)
Wayside pits and quarries do not require special zoning under the Pits and Quarries Control Act and we suggest the reference in this section to wayside pits and quarries be deleted. The last sentence of policy 7 should be reconsidered to prevent confusion with the Pits and Quarries Control Act.

Reference to wayside pits and quarries has been removed.

05.2.7.0 10( ) (Point #10)
Ministry of Natural Resources should be replaced by Ministry of Northern Development and Mines.

This has been done.

05.3.1.0 00( )
05.3.2.0

(Points #11 & #12)
The reference to policies in 5.3.5 should be 5.3.6.

This has been corrected.

00.0.0.0 00( ) A

(Point #13)
Request that the region consider placing wetlands falling in classes 1 and 2 on Schedule A and any of the wetlands in classes 3-7 which may be of regional significance on the schedule.

It is not the intention at this time to revise the policies relating to environmental lands. Once the Province has finalized its wetland policy there may, however, be need to make revisions to the Regional Plan.

00.0.0.0 00( ) A

(Point #14)
High value forest sites have been identified. The region may wish to consider adding these areas to schedule A.

It is not the intent to designate forest lands unless they are within an environmental area.

Brief #117: Ms. Bueno

06.2.1.0 01(b)

(Point #01)
The region is not doing enough to create sufficient numbers of affordable housing.

The Plan adopted by Council contains a number of policies directed towards the provision of affordable housing, recognizing that responsibilities for housing policy are split between the region, local municipalities, and the provincial and federal governments. These policies address both the provision of affordable housing by the private sector and the provision of assisted housing.

11.1.0.0 01( )

(Point #02)
The Plan should include reference to a better and cheaper transportation system to facilitate movement between the different sub-areas within the region.

One of the goals of the Plan is to provide a land use and transportation system which emphasizes convenience of movement between destinations and another is to minimize the public cost of required services consistent with overall benefit.

01.3.0.0 00( )

(Point #03)
The rate of economic growth (jobs) appears to be slowing down. Many of the jobs that are being created are not full-time permanent jobs which creates an income problem for a large segment of the population.

Economic growth in Ottawa-Carleton was greater in 1981 to 1986 (+ 50,270 jobs) than in 1976 to 1981 (+ 19,640 jobs) based on Planning Department employment surveys. It is agreed that the proportion of jobs which are part-time and the resulting impacts on income and related factors such as household creation are matters which need to be studied and considered when projections are done.

01.0.0.0 00( )

(Point #04)
The Plan is difficult to understand for a lay person.

The official plan adopted by Regional Council contains rewordings and clarifications where comments indicated confusion or difficulty in understanding proposed policies.

03.4.2.0 01(d) (Point #05)
Support for energy conservation objectives and policies.

The energy conservation objectives and policies of the May 1987 draft are included without change in the official plan adopted by Regional Council.

03.4.2.0 01(c) (Points #05 & 06)
(d) Support for energy conservation objectives and policies.

The energy conservation objectives and policies of the May 1987 draft are included without change in the official plan adopted by Regional Council.

Brief #118: Mme. Monique Riese

00.0.0.0 00( ) C1 (Point #01)
She is concerned that existing Highway 16 is shown as a proposed regional road. She does not see why the region has to take it on.

Highway 16 is shown as a proposed regional road in the official plan adopted by Regional Council. When Highway 416 is built, Highway 16 will no longer serve as a provincial highway. However, it will continue to have a very important function, providing transportation service to the South Urban Centre. Being located along the Rideau River, it meets several criteria for being a regional road.

08.4.0.0 05( ) (Point #02)
She would like the Prescott Highway to be designated a scenic route all the way.

It is so designated.

02.2.0.0 05( ) (Point #03)
Policy 5 is not necessary if Policy 3 is done in a specified time.

It is agreed that a policy permitting an initial phase of development of the South Urban Centre before approval of an amendment to the regional official plan for the entire South Urban Centre is not required, if approval of the Regional Official Plan amendment could be certain within a specified time. However, approval could be delayed by a number of factors, including referral to the Ontario Municipal Board. This policy provides flexibility to increase the urban residential land supply in the event of unavoidable delays to the overall amendment.

Brief #119: Mr. W. Terrance Denison, Perley-Robertson, Panet, et.al. for Terrace Investments Limited)

00.0.0.0 00( ) AB (Point #01)
Request is for Riddell Village. Would like to be designated urban area rather than general rural on Schedule A and would like to be designated general urban area on Schedule B.

This land has been designated as part of the urban area.

Brief #120: Mr. Barry Wellar, PhD, MCIP

01.0.0.0 00( ) (Point #01)
Changes to the draft official plan by Planning Committee, Regional Council and Ontario Municipal Board should satisfy planning principles.

Agreed.

01.0.0.0 00( ) (Point #02)
The Ontario Municipal Board will place considerable if not overwhelming emphasis on the planning principle aspect.

It is agreed that Ontario Municipal Board hearings and deliberations will include consideration of planning principles.

01.0.0.0 00( ) (Point #03)
The Planning Dept. should compile and document the set of planning principles actually and explicitly contained or referenced in the draft and proposed official plans.

The staff report which Planning Committee considered during its deliberations on the revised official plan after the public meeting made explicit reference to planning principles in its discussion of the major points made in the various submissions.

01.0.0.0 00( ) (Point #04)
The Planning Dept. should compile and document a cross-listing which relates the respective planning principles to the policies, goals, objectives and interests contained in both the draft official plan and the proposed official plan.

A cross-listing has not been prepared. It is believed that the underlying planning principles are adequately expressed in the interests, goals, objectives and policies of the official plan adopted by Regional Council.

01.0.0.0 00( ) (Point #05)
Materials prepared should be made available at the earliest moment to persons, groups and corporations concerned about the substance and process of the official plan.

The staff report which Planning Committee considered during its deliberations on the revised official plan after the public meeting made explicit reference to planning principles in its discussion of the major points made in the various submissions. Copies of this report are available upon request.

Brief #121: Mr. David M. Lewis, Queenswood Heights Community Association

02.1.6.0 00( ) (Point #01)
The plan states that sewage and water services will be installed for a minimum population of 75,000. Since the projected population of the Orleans area is expected to be 90,000 plus, we believe that allowance be made for the increase in population and services of sufficient capacity be supplied.

There is no reference to a minimum population of 75,000 in the Official Plan adopted by Regional Council. It is Council's intent to provide services of sufficient capacity for the projected population of Orleans.

02.1.7.0 00( )

(Point #02)
As the present population already creates enough vehicular traffic to exceed the capacity of the Queensway during peak periods, we feel that completion of the transitway to Orleans

Town Centre and the construction and upgrading of major roads be made first priority items.

In the Official Plan adopted by Regional Council completion of the transitway system inside the greenbelt and of transitway stations in the town centres of the urban centres has first priority. Extension of the transitway system to Kanata and Orleans is second priority and to the south urban centre is third priority (policies 19 and 20 in Part 11). Road improvements have not been priorized in the Plan; priorities will be determined by Regional Council in the 5-year capital budget forecast, based on a variety of indicators of need (see policy 6 in Part 11). Growth in traffic and hence need for road improvements depends on a variety of factors which are not easily predicted, but which will be monitored.

03.1.3.2 00( )
03.1.3.3
03.1.3.4

(Points #03 to #05)
Until such time as proper transportation and services are provided, it is doubtful that the east urban community will reach its potential of employment opportunities.

The Official Plan adopted by Regional Council identifies a number of improvements to the transportation and service infrastructure for the Orleans urban centre, e.g. extension of the transitway to the Town Centre, the Blackburn Hamlet by-pass and related improvements to Innes Road. It is agreed that Orlean's full employment potential will not be realized until this infrastructure is provided, however, each infrastructure improvement (e.g. extension of services to an Extensive Employment Area) will increase the opportunities for employment growth. A transitway station in the Town Centre of Orleans is identified as a first priority in the policies for the transitway system in Section 11.4.2.

03.2.3.1 00( )

(Point #06)
Place D'Orleans Shopping Centre should be designated a regional shopping centre since with upcoming expansion it will be one in fact if not in name.

The Official Plan adopted by Regional Council in May 1988 designates Place D'Orleans a Regional Shopping Centre on Schedule B.

03.3.3.0 00( )

(Point #07)
The condition that major facilities be located in a central location could in some instances be physically impossible and in others greatly increase the construction costs.

The criterion is "central location with respect to service area population", not central location within an urban area or urban centre. It is one of several criteria listed in the official plan adopted by Regional Council. Another criterion is "any special requirements of the specific facility under review" which would include site area requirements. The wording of the policy is "Council shall consider the need for" which permits Council to weigh

the relative importance of the factors listed, but ensures that they all receive consideration.

03.4.3.0 00( )

(Point #08)
Consideration be given to the complete separation of bicycle and automobile routes since the present system of mixed traffic is extremely hazardous especially on overcrowded roads.

The revised official plan adopted by Regional Council has two major provisions concerning separate bicycle routes. The fifth paragraph of Section 11.2.1 concerning roads has been amended to say "Where appropriate and feasible, the right-of-way of regional roads should include sufficient spaces to accommodate... bicycle paths". A system of Major Bicycle Corridors is designated on Schedule F, which Council will protect and enhance.

06.2.3.0 00( )

(Point #09)
Council should give all encouragement possible to private non-profit organisations to develop affordable housing.

The Plan adopted by Council provides a number of policies in Section 6 directed to the provision of affordable housing by private non-profit organizations in addition to municipal non-profit agencies and cooperatives.

10.1.2.0 00( )

(Point #10)
As previously stated in 2.1.6, services should be provided to the EUC on a priority basis and have a capacity sufficient to support a population of 90,000 plus.

Policy 1 of Section 10.1.2 of the official plan adopted by Regional Council gives priority to the completion of the Gloucester-Cumberland sewer (and other sewers for the West Urban Centre) before the Region provides any financing for the extension of sewer services to the South Urban Centre or Leitrim.

11.2.2.0 00( )

(Point #11)
The construction of the Innes/Walkley connection from the Blackburn Hamlet By-pass to Walkley/ Hunt Club Road be moved from Tier 2 to Tier 1. In addition the expansion of the 10th Line Road from Innes to St. Joseph Boulevard should be included as Tier 1.

There is no "tiering" of road improvements in the official plan adopted by Regional Council. Council will determine the priority of improvements to the regional road system in its five-year capital budget forecast in the context of monitoring reports and other indicators of need.

11.4.2.0 00( )

(Point #12)
The transitway extension to Orleans Town Centre be made a top priority item so that some of the Queensway congestion can be relieved.

Extension of the transitway system to Orleans is a second priority. The first priorities are completion of the system inside the greenbelt and stations in the town centres of the urban centres.

Brief #122: Mr. W.P. McKinley

04.2.2.0 00( ) (Point #01)
The initial concern regarding the 2-kilometre distance has been addressed to my satisfaction.

Policies concerning the 2 kilometre distance are the same in the Official Plan adopted by Council as in the May 1987 draft Plan.

04.2.3.0 16( ) (Point #02)
Clarification requested on the policy requiring local municipalities to locate country lots in such a way that villages and urban areas can continue to expand in the years ahead on land land designated general rural area rather than on land designated for a natural resource.

The intent is that if a village or urban area can only expand in one direction without going onto resource lands, this one direction should not be compromised by permitting country lot development.

Brief #123: Carroll Paquette, Consumers Gas

00.0.0.0 00( ) (Point #01)
No comment on the official plan.

Brief #124: Mr. Michael Noonan, Ottawa-Carleton Home Builders' Association

00.0.0.0 00( ) (Point #01)
[Report of comments made at the Planning Committee meeting; brief #69 refers.]

Brief #125: Mr. A.J. Schouten, National Capital Commission

02.2.0.0 03( ) (Point #01)
Would like to be involved in the planning study to be undertaken jointly with the cities of Nepean and Gloucester. NCC's interests include the greenbelt, preservation of agricultural land and recreational corridors, road and service infrastructure, the impacts on the Rideau River, future airport expansion, and noise cones and the assurance of separation between the the south and west urban centres.

The Official Plan adopted by Regional Council no longer makes reference to a joint study for the south urban centre. The National Capital Commission will have to deal directly with the Cities of Gloucester and Nepean.

03.1.3.1 02( ) (Point #02)
Support for this policy. National Capital Commission will be a willing participant.

The Official Plan adopted by Regional Council continues to call for cooperative planning by the Region, the National Capital Commission and the City of Ottawa for the future development of the Central Area.

09.2.0.0 04( ) F (Point #03)
Support for the scenic routes and the joint study with area municipalities.

This policy remains in the Plan.

03.5.3.0 02( ) (Point #04)
Policy should be amended to read "consult" rather than "review jointly".

The revised Official Plan adopted by Regional Council contains the above-noted rewording.

00.0.0.0 00( ) A (Point #05)
Concern that greenbelt lands are designated in a manner different from the federal land use plan and the greenbelt management plan, specifically natural environment area designation should extend north of Highway 7 (Stoney Swamp) and parts of the Mer Bleue should be designated natural environment area.

The application of resource area designations (e.g. Agricultural Resource) and environmental designations (e.g. Waterfront Open Space, Natural Environment Area) to greenbelt lands is based on the same criteria used for these designations elsewhere in Ottawa-Carleton. This provides for consistency within the regional official plan but has resulted in differences with the federal land use plan and greenbelt management plan. These differences are not viewed as creating problems as the policies for the Greenbelt Reserve designation permit uses of a generally open rural character. This provides sufficient flexibility for the NCC to manage these lands for agriculture, forestry or conservation purposes without any conflict with the regional official plan.

00.0.0.0 00( ) A (Point #06)
The mineral resource area north of Blackburn Hamlet should be removed if the NCC exercises its option to purchase.

This is an important resource but will be redesignated once depleted.

00.0.0.0 00( ) A (Point #07)
Land east of the Rideau River shown as greenbelt reserve should be designated agricultural resource area.

This is too small to warrant being designated in the Regional Plan.

03.5.3.0 00( ) (Point #08)
The greenbelt reserve designation is vague.

In the Official Plan adopted by Regional Council, the Greenbelt Reserve designation is used for greenbelt land with less significant resource value. The designation indicates Council's intent to maintain the open, essentially rural character of the greenbelt.

00.0.0.0 00( ) B (Point #09)
Proposed employment nodes at Rockcliffe Air Base and Uplands should be shown.

The airport has been designated Greenbelt Reserve (Ottawa International Airport and CFB Uplands) on Schedule A. Policy 4 of Section 3.5.3 permits the airport to be used for civilian and military airport purposes and for purposes that would otherwise be allowed in Extensive Employment Areas.
CFB Rockcliffe has been designated General Urban Area. While the lands associated with the base may have significant development potential, the existing level of employment and intensity of land use are best reflected in the General Urban policies. A Secondary Employment Centre designation is not appropriate because this location is not on the transitway and does not have good road access. The Federal Land Use Plan is not specific as to the federal

government's intentions for an employment node at this location. When these intentions are known, Ottawa-Carleton and the NCC can consider what designation would be appropriate.

00.0.0.0 00( ) C1 (Point #10)
The eastern driveway and its proposed extension to Orleans is opposed.

The Ottawa River Parkway East and its extension to Orleans is shown on Schedule C1 of the official plan adopted by Regional Council. It is recognized that this proposal cannot be implemented without the agreement of the National Capital Commission. However, this road link is also in the approved regional official plan and right-of-way for the facility through the East Urban Centre has been obtained through conditions of plan of subdivision approval. It would not be prudent to foreclose this option for additional road capacity by deleting the proposal from the regional official plan.

00.0.0.0 00( ) C1 (Point #11)
The Hunt Club-Knoxdale-Richmond Road connection through Stoney Swamp is opposed. NCC is prepared to discuss options for providing additional capacity to Kanata.

The Hunt Club/Knoxdale/Richmond Road connection is shown on Schedule C1 of the official plan adopted by Regional Council. The development already committed in the Bridlewood area of Kanata means a major east-west road must be provided south of Bells Corners. There are few alternatives available. One is the extension of Hope Side Road easterly to Cedarview Road. This will require a detailed analysis. It is proposed that the Region undertake this with the cooperation of all parties after the approval of this Plan. If it is determined that an alternative route is feasible and preferable, the Plan can be amended.

00.0.0.0 00( ) C1 (Point #12)
The intersection of the future Inner Ring Road with Highway 417 will result in excessive land take from the greenbelt. Other options should be looked at.

Proposed regional roads such as the Inner Provincial Highway Bypass (Inner Ring Road) are shown on Schedule C1 in approximate locations only (and details of intersections are not shown at all). This project will be subject to the requirements of the Environmental Assessment Act, which requires that options be considered.

11.5.0.0 00( ) (Point #13)
The Plan should contain a policy to the effect that the pedestrian environment is at least as important to the quality of the urban environment as the needs of automobiles. In this way opportunities to widen right-of-way particularly in the core area can be used to benefit pedestrians as well as drivers.

The suggested policy has not been added. However, road widening policies in the core area are used to benefit pedestrians. The "Widening/Easement Policy" (policy 8 of Part 11)

is used to obtain surface easements, primarily for the use of pedestrians.

00.0.0.0 00( ) C1 (Point #14)
The extension of Baseline Road to Timm Drive will result in the loss of agricultural land. Alternatives should be examined.

The extension of Baseline Road to Timm Drive will be subject to the Environmental Assessment Act, which requires that alternatives be considered.

00.0.0.0 00( ) C1 (Point #15)
The Blackburn Hamlet Bypass extension will have to be negotiated with the NCC. Concern about increased land take.

The Blackburn Hamlet Bypass Extension is included in the official plan adopted by Regional Council. It is recognized that any alignment on greenbelt lands will have to be negotiated with the NCC.

00.0.0.0 00( ) C1 (Point #16)
The Walkley-Blair-Innes Connection is pure conjecture. No agreement has been reached with the NCC.

Proposed regional roads, such as the Walkley/ Blair/Innes connection, are shown on Schedule C1 in approximate locations only. Studies and negotiation with the National Capital Commission are both required before a more exact configuration is decided.

11.5.0.0 00( ) (Point #17)
It should be RMOC policy that their bikeways whenever possible link with other bikeway systems in the region.

Although not explicitly stated in the official plan, the Major Bicycle Corridors on Schedule F were selected primarily on this basis. It is not the intent of Council to directly implement a system of bikeways, but rather to protect the opportunity for a continuous system through conditions placed on the approval of plans of subdivision and condominium and land severances.

Brief #126: Mr. Philip Brown, M.C.I.P., Ottawa Federation of Housing Cooperatives, Inc.

06.2.1.0 05( )
06.2.3.0 08 (Points #01 & #02)
Add the phrase "and cooperative" after "private non-profit" and before "housing corporations".

Policies 5 and 8 in Part 6 have been revised to incorporate this phrase.

06.2.3.3 00( ) (Point #03)
Reference should also be made to Housing Co-operatives in meeting the targets for assisted housing units. It is suggested that the following statement be included "the plan recognises and supports the role played by cooperative housing as an alternative form of tenure for assisted housing projects which encourages resident involvement in project management and community decision making".

Policies in Part 6 (policies 5 and 8 specifically) include reference to cooperative housing in addition to non-profit agencies in meeting the

targets for assisted housing units. The Plan does not make any statement of the value of co-operative versus other tenure forms since all tenure types of assisted housing contribute to achievement of the affordable housing objective.

06.2.3.0 00( )

(Point #04)
The third paragraph first sentence should be corrected since the federal government through CMHC also determines the amount of funding available for assisted housing both indirectly through grants to the province, and directly, through the federal cooperative housing program.

The Plan adopted by Council contains this revision. (Sentence now reads "The federal and provincial governments...).

06.2.2.0 00( )

(Point #05)
Suggests a new policy be added as follows "Council shall encourage the development and use of surplus regional lands for assisted housing wherever feasible and appropriate and shall encourage area municipalities to adopt similar policies with respect to their surplus properties".

The use of surplus land for assisted housing will be considered as part of the Regional Housing Statement Update to be initiated in 1988.

06.2.3.0 00( )

(Point #06)
The following is proposed as a new policy "Council shall make representations to federal and provincial governments as appropriate to encourage them to set realistic maximum unit price guidelines for assisted housing projects which take into account all factors contributing to the cost of such a project including municipal development charges and levies".

The requested policies are too specific to current housing program operation for inclusion in the Official Plan. These and other detailed housing policy matters which Council may wish to consider are more appropriately addressed in Regional Housing Statements. Municipal development charges are one of the cost factors considered when maximum unit prices are established.

06.2.3.0 00( )

(Point #07)
A new policy is proposed as follows "until such time as maximum unit price guidelines are revised to take fully into account municipal development charges and levies, Council shall consider on a case-by-case basis exempting assisted housing projects from regional development charges where such charges would result in an otherwise viable project exceeding the maximum allowable project budget".

The requested polices are too specific to current housing program operation for inclusion in the Official Plan. These and other detailed housing policy matters which Council may wish to consider are more appropriately addressed in Regional Housing Statements.
When Regional Council increased Regional Development Charges (RDCs) in summer 1988, it also adopted a resolution requesting CMHC and the provincial government to adjust the maximum unit prices for Ottawa-Carleton to include the increased RDCs. In the interim the Region will pay a grant equivalent to the increase in RDCs

for assisted housing built under the 1988 maximum unit price.

06.2.3.0 00( ) (Point #08)
A new policy is proposed as follows "Council shall endeavour to facilitate the planning approval process for assisted housing projects by: a) encouraging municipalities to expedite the process of rezoning and other planning approval applications from groups developing assisted housing projects; b) urging federal and provincial governments to take into account the rezoning process when developing assisted housing program guidelines; and c) encouraging and supporting the prezoning of appropriate public lands for the development of municipal, private non-profit and cooperative housing projects".

The Plan adopted by Council does not specifically address this policy. The requirement in the Plan for preparation of a Regional Housing Statement and Annual Housing Review provides appropriate vehicles for Council to adopt additional policies should the local approval process appear to be hindering achievement of Council's objectives for the delivery of assisted housing.

Brief #127: Mr. P.D.C. Barnhouse, Highland Park Ratepayers' Association

06.2.3.0 07( ) (Point #01)
Objects to the region being involved in this aspect. The policy puts in jeopardy areas of single-family housing. What is required is a mix of housing in each area.

Policy 7 encourages local municipalities to seek ways of reducing the cost of housing through amending local building, occupancy and development regulations. Any resulting changes to existing by-laws are recognized as a matter for the local municipality to decide "if deemed desirable".

06.2.6.0 12( ) (Point #02)
It is an impossible task to distribute group homes evenly throughout the region. Suggests that the policy should require increased spacing and decreased density so that there would be fewer homes in each community.

The policy on group homes requires that they be permitted in all primarily residential areas. It is intended to remove barriers that may now exist in local zoning by-laws which inhibit a a more equal distribution of group homes. However, the policy permits local municipalities to establish separation distances in their zoning by-laws. Building and land costs, suitability of available existing housing, proximity to special services, and other locational factors will also affect the distribution of group homes.

11.2.2.0 00( ) C1 (Point #03)
Against having both the Scott Street extension and the Byron Avenue transit route.

Both the Scott Street extension and the Byron Avenue transitway are in the official plan adopted by Regional Council. However, Council has also directed staff to identify an at grade alternative transit route on or adjacent to the Western Parkway.

11.4.2.0 16( ) E (Point #04)
Objects to the Byron Avenue transit route as not being necessary and too expensive. Suggest the region should convince the NCC to allow continued use of the Parkway.

The Region continues to negotiate with the NCC about continued use of the Parkway.

Brief #128: Ms. Marey Gregory

02.1.3.0 04( ) (Point #01)
Supports an urban centre south of the greenbelt and suggests there should be more emphasis on it.

The revised Official Plan adopted by Regional Council provides for the development of the south urban centre. The emphasis is unchanged from the May 1987 draft version of the Official Plan.

02.2.0.0 03(d) (Point #02)
Support for identifying location of the Outer Ring Road now.

The planning for the south urban centre will have to address the location of the Outer Provincial Highway Bypass (Outer Ring Road).

02.2.0.0 04( ) (Point #03)
Support 4. Recognizes the importance of getting the levels of employment in the urban centres.

The Official Plan adopted by Regional Council continues to call for a balance between potential residential development and potential commercial and industrial development.

11.2.3.0 06( ) (Point #04)
Support for identifying the Outer Ring Road now.

The Outer Ring Road is now called the Outer Provincial Highway Bypass in the official plan adopted by Regional Council. On 22 June 88 Council approved the South Urban Centre Strategic Study, currently underway, which will determine the location of a corridor for the Outer Provincial Highway Bypass.

11.1.0.0 05( ) (Point #05)
Having been involved in the Highway 416 process recognises there are problems with the environmental assessment process.

The provincial government is currently conducting a review of the environmental assessment process in which the Region will participate.

Brief #129: Mr. C. Richard Hudson, R.A.M.P.

00.0.0.0 00( ) C2 (Point #01)
He is against the widening of Riverside Drive to six lanes and assumes that if Council does not adopt amendment 69, that schedule C2 will also be changed.

The May 1987 draft Plan showed a six lane (40 m right-of-way) Riverside from Hunt Club Road to the Queensway. In the official plan adopted by Regional Council, Riverside is four lane (34 m right-of-way) except for the portion between Limebank Road and the Inner Ring Road which is still six lane (40 m). The six-lane section on Riverside Drive will enable South Urban Centre

traffic to feed into the Provincial Highway Bypass east-west distribution.

Brief #130: Ms. Maria Neil & Mae Nickson, Council of Women of Ottawa and Area

01.7.2.0 07( ) (Point #01)
Recognize the need for an arbitrator or coordinator between the municipalities and the federal government. At the very least more consultation is required between municipalities and the federal government.

Regional Council cannot impose an arbitrator on the federal government. There are ongoing efforts on the part of both municipalities and the federal government to improve the level of consultation.

02.1.3.0 04( ) (Points #02 & #03)
02.1.5.0 06 They would like the plan to recognise a theme or policy of self-sustaining communities which would be self-contained in housing, work and leisure.

The revised Official Plan adopted by Regional Council has an objective that each urban centre provide a mix of housing types, a variety of jobs, and a full range of urban services and facilities, (Section 2.1.5 Objective 6). A subsequent policy sets minima and maxima for dwelling units and jobs in each urban centre in order to balance residential and employment opportunities.

03.1.2.0 07( ) (Point #04)
Would like the Plan to recognize the need for self contained computer facilities in the suburbs which would be linked to main computers elsewhere.

The policies contained in Section 3.1.2 of the Region's revised Official Plan do not preclude the establishment of self contained computer facilities in the suburbs which are in turn linked to main computers elsewhere.

03.4.2.0 01( ) (Point #05)
The Plan should recognize the importance of structuring the community with paths for cycles and pedestrians.

Objective 1 b) in Section 3.4.2 of the revised official plan adopted by Regional Council continues to call for provision for safe and convenient pedestrian and bicycle travel.

03.1.3.2 04( ) (Point #06)
The Plan should recognize the need for day care centres at transitway stations.

The policies contained in Section 3.1.3.2 of the Region's revised Official Plan do not preclude the establishment of day care centres in Primary Employment Centres at transitway stations.

03.1.3.3 08( ) (Point #07)
The Plan should recognize the need for day care centres at transitway stations.

The policies contained in Section 3.1.3.3 of the Region's revised Official Plan do not preclude the establishment of day care centres in Secondary Employment Centres at transitway stations.

07.2.3.0 18( ) (Point #08)
They would like to see parkland used as a baffle in noisy situations. The transitway is given as an example.

The location of parkland is a matter for local municipalities to decide.

09.3.0.0 00( ) (Point #08)
Existing policies for the preservation of heritage buildings are not working. They should be strengthened.

This topic cannot be addressed in a regional official plan.

06.2.6.0 13( ) (Point #09)
Support for Council continuing to provide emergency housing.

Council adopted the proposed policy on provision of emergency housing.

Brief #131: Ms. Daphne Wreathem, J.L. Richards & Associates Ltd. (for Central Canada Exhibition Ass.)

03.3.3.0 01( ) (Point #01)
They would like the CCEA site in West Carleton Township to be designated "major community facility". They consider they will be able to meet the criteria established in policy 2. However, their background study will not be available until October. CCEA is hoping to move to the new site in 1991.

Information is required on matters such as the facilities and activities to be located on the proposed CCEA site, servicing proposals and access to 417 in order to evaluate this proposal. As this information is not yet available, the request will have to be considered separately, and if it is acceptable will be the subject of a separate amendment.

Brief #132: Ms. L. Westell

11.4.2.0 20( ) (Point #01)
The Mediacom bus shelters are not as good as OC Transpo's shelters because they block the view.

Bus shelter design is an operational matter for OC Transpo, not an official plan matter.

11.4.2.0 20( ) (Point #02)
Transit stations are too open, have no heating, no phones and no washrooms. They also require direction signs giving an indication of the streets being accessed.

OC Transpo has recently conducted a survey to determine, among other things, what kind of facilities are desired in transit stations.

Brief #133: Mrs. Amy Browell, Vanier Parkway Extension Committee

00.0.0.0 00( ) C1 (Point #01)
Ottawa City Council approved a recommendation to delete the Vanier Parkway extension on 21 May 86.

When Ottawa City Council considered its response to the draft official plan on 4 Nov. 87 it defeated a recommendation that the Vanier Parkway Extension (and other roads) be deleted from Schedule C1 of the regional official plan.

00.0.0.0 00( ) C1 (Point #02)
An argument is made that it will alleviate traffic cutting through New Edinburgh. But only a small part of that traffic is going directly to Hull and no egress will be allowed once one is on the bridge.

The congestion at Beechwood/St. Patrick and King Edward/Murray, King Edward/St. Patrick is becoming intolerable. Consequently alternatives such as along Crichton St., through New Edinburgh are attractive for traffic destined for Sussex Drive (City Hall, etc.) The completion of the Vanier Parkway will reduce the congestion on the St. Patrick/ Murray/King Edward road network thus making that route again attractive - hence relieving short-cutting through New Edinburgh. Traffic to Hull is not the issue.

00.0.0.0 00( ) C1 (Point #03)
The $20 m cost is too expensive and it would be better put towards the Kettle Island Bridge.

The study of future interprovincial bridge crossings, involving the NCC, the Provincial Governments of Ontario and Quebec, as well as the RMOC and CRO, will determine among other things the cost of constructing a bridge at Kettle Island. It is expected that this cost will be many times that of completing the Vanier Parkway. There is also no guarantee that the Kettle Island location will be the first priority among future river crossings.

00.0.0.0 00( ) C1 (Point #04)
She contends that the Vanier Parkway Extension will not alleviate congestion on St. Patrick and King Edward.

There is no doubt that it will. (The King Edward Avenue Traffic Study Report of the City of Ottawa should be read for an independent opinion.)

00.0.0.0 00( ) C1 (Point #05)
With the designation in the Plan people are having difficulty getting mortgages on Crichton Street and there is difficulty upgrading New Edinburgh Park.

The designation of the Vanier Parkway extension may be cited as an excuse for delaying improvements to New Edinburgh Park and refusing mortgages but it is not a valid reason. Sufficient work has been done on the design of the Vanier Parkway to identify the impact on New Edinburgh Park. Improvements may be directed to those parts which will not be impacted. Any private property on Crichton Street which is required for the extension would have to be acquired at fair market value.

00.0.0.0 00( ) C1 (Point #06)
If it was built there would be pressure to open the Vanier Parkway to trucks.

This is true. As the Vanier Parkway would be a regional road linking an interprovincial bridge crossing to the Queensway, there will undoubtedly be pressure to include it in the truck route system.

Brief #134: Ms. Sylvia Grant, Township of West Carleton

04.2.2.0 00( )
10.1.2.0 05

(Points #01 & #02)
Reference should be made to the status of servicing the village of Carp and this village should be exempted from any requirement for amendment to the Regional Official Plan.

Proposals to provide servicing to Carp are proceeding on the basis of the existing Regional Official Plan which does not require an amendment. If the system(s) to serve Carp are approved before the new Plan is approved, the change can probably be done by ministerial modification. If the new official plan is approved first, an amendment will be required.

04.2.1.0 04( )

(Point #03)
Guidelines for severances on regional roads should be included in the official plan.

Guidelines should not be incorporated into the Plan as they are not in themselves policy. Staff would however be prepared to work with local municipalities, if requested, in developing guidelines.

04.2.3.0 13( )

(Point #04)
Development of commercial/industrial assessment is vital. Industrial and commercial uses should not be restricted. Local municipalities should have the same powers as they now have.

There is no substantive change in the policies from those in the existing Plan.

04.2.5.0 19( )

(Point #05)
There is an inconsistency between policy 19 and policy 7 of section 10.1.2 in that policy 19 appears to permit development by site specific zoning by-law amendment but policy 7 requires a regional official plan amendment.

These two policies have been rewritten to be consistent. No Regional Official Plan amendment is required.

05.2.7.0 11( )

(Point #06)
Mineral resource policies should be reviewed in 5 years time and the region should commit itself to cooperating with local municipalities in the rehabilitation of worked out sites.

The Regional Official Plan states that a review of Mineral Resource policies will be undertaken not later than ten years after the policies' adoption (i.e. 1993). It is not evident that the Region has a role in rehabilitating worked-out pits.

06.2.6.0 12( )

(Point #07)
The policy should be amended to reflect the fact that local municipalities may regulate separation distances between group homes and the location of certain types of group homes.

The policy adopted by Council was amended to incorporate this suggestion.

07.2.1.0 00( )

(Point #08)
A reference should be included to the study being undertaken by the Township of West Carleton and the policies should permit development to go ahead if floodproofing requirements

are clearly set out in the zoning by-law without further amendment.

Policy does permit development to proceed without a zoning amendment where fill and construction regulations exist and a permit is issued under these regulations.

08.3.4.0 00( )
08.3.4.0 04
08.7.0.0 00
08.7.0.0 07

(Points #09 to #12)
This policy should be reconsidered and the region should either confirm its commitment to acquire sites in question or permit the land to be dealt with in accordance with the policies covering the river corridor generally.

The Region should not be obliged to buy recreationally-designated land which is already in recreational use.

11.2.4.0 08( )

(Point #13)
Reference to the size of the proposed addition should be deleted and the wording of the Planning Act be inserted, i.e. "which substantially increases the size or useability of structure or building ...".

This has been done in the official plan adopted by Regional Council.

01.6.0.0 01( )

(Point #14)
There is a concern that by including the whole of the text as the official plan there may be contradictions between the fine print and the conclusions in heavy print.

All of the text included in Parts 1 to 11 is part of the revised official plan adopted by Regional Council. Experience has shown that the fine print provides useful clarification as to the intent and interpretation of the objectives and policies in heavy print.

Brief #135: Mr. Howard Maguire

00.0.0.0 00( ) AB

(Point #01)
West 1/2 lot 24, concession 9, Township of Goulbourn. The property has been changed from marginal resource to agricultural resource. He disagrees with this because of its stoney condition and low productivity. The land has not been cultivated for the last 15 years.

A majority of the land has been designated General Rural but the north part has been included in the urban area of Stittsville.

00.0.0.0 00( ) AB

(Point #02)
He supports Goulbourn Township's amendment 54 which extends the village boundary to the south.

Stittsville has been expanded to include this area on Schedule A of the official plan adopted by Regional Council.

Brief #136: Mr. Pierre R. Lavigne, Scott & Aylen (for Gloucester Equestrian Centre Ltd.)

07.2.3.0 13( ) AB

(Point #01)
He questions the NEP 2000 noise contours because the original plan was based on a 2001 population of 1 million and the proposed plan is based on a population of 725,000 for 2001. He requests the region verify with Transport Canada their noise exposure projections are based on the current projection of a population of 725,000 for the year 2001.

The noise contours are not related to a population projection. The noise contours in the official plan adopted by Regional Council are the current ones prepared by Transport Canada.

07.2.3.0 15( ) (Point #02)
He questions the distinction being made between inside and outside the greenbelt and suggests that the NEF/NEP 35 contour be used outside the greenbelt where the lands constitute an extension of an existing subdivision.

There is no longer a distinction between inside and outside the greenbelt.

07.2.3.0 16( ) (Point #03)
He believes that site-specific natural topography is not the only reason why noise received at a particular site may be less than that established by the NEF or NEP contours. He requests a change to policy 16 which would permit development to be approved if it is demonstrated that the noise actually received is less than the limits established by the NEF or NEP noise contour.

Reference has been added to acknowledge that factors other than topography can lead to a noise reduction and hence to permitting development that otherwise would be prohibited.

04.2.3.0 12( ) (Point #04)
He questions the need for 0.8 hectare lots in the general rural area. The Gloucester equestrian centre site will be serviced with water and is an extension of an existing subdivision which already has lots smaller than 0.8 hectares and should be exempt from this provision.

The Region's concern is that rural and urban areas should be distinct. In retaining the character of the rural area, density control is important. If small lots were permitted, subdivisions could be expanded to become hamlets or villages.

04.2.3.0 15( ) (Point #05)
Suggests an additional sub-point be added to the effect that "notwithstanding policy 12 Council may approve plans of subdivision with country lots smaller than 0.8 hectares if the proposed plan of subdivision constitutes the extension of an existing small lot subdivision and the proposed development is compatible with the existing small lot subdivision".

Allowing existing subdivisions where the lots are smaller than 0.8 ha to expand would have the effect of creating ad hoc hamlets and also is not in accord with the objective of ensuring that the density of rural development outside villages does not create a lower density suburbia.

Brief #137: Mr. & Mrs. F.D. Lute

00.0.0.0 00( ) C1 (Point #01)
Expresses concern about the Westboro Community Association's position on the Kirkwood Avenue extension. Does not recognise any immediate need to extend Kirkwood Avenue to Champlain Bridge or Scott Street and strongly opposes the recommendation of the Westboro Community Assoc.

The Kirkwood Avenue extension to Scott Street is included in the official plan adopted by Regional Council. This project is considered necessary to carry future traffic volumes in this area. The need (and timing) for the extension is primarily dependent on the timing of high density development on lands north of Scott Street. (It is not proposed to extend Kirkwood to the Champlain Bridge).

Brief #138: Colleen Findlay

00.0.0.0 00( ) C1 (Point #01)
Expresses concern about the Westboro Community Association's position on the Kirkwood Avenue Extension. Does not recognise any immediate need to extend Kirkwood Avenue to Champlain Bridge or Scott Street and strongly opposes the recommendation of the Westboro Community Assoc.

The Kirkwood Avenue extension is included in the official plan adopted by Regional Council. This project is considered necessary to carry future traffic volumes in this area. The need (and timing) for the extension is primarily dependent on the timing of high density development on lands north of Scott Street. (It is not proposed to extend Kirkwood to the Champlain Bridge).

Brief #139: Mr. Wayne W. Tallon, City of Vanier

00.0.0.0 00( ) (Point #01)
[Cross reference to brief 53. This is a certified true copy of resolution 87-249 confirming the City of Vanier's brief.]

Brief #140: Mrs. Lillian Hobbs

00.0.0.0 00( ) A (Point #01)
Request that lands (E 1/2 lot 12, conc. 6) not be changed from marginal resource to agricultural resource. Because of a strange mixture of soils and beaver dams, the land cannot be farmed.

The S 1/2 of the E 1/2 lot 12 conc. 6 Goulbourn has been left as General Rural but the N 1/2 contains class 2 and 3 land and has been designated Agricultural Resource.

00.0.0.0 00( ) A (Point #02)
25 acres of our land (SE part, W 1/2, lot 14, conc. 6, Goulbourn) is mostly all treed and is not tillable. It is no better than land across the road that you propose as general rural. Please change it from agricultural resource to general rural.

The twenty-five acres have been designated Agricultural Resource as it is part of a larger block of farm land. Depending on local circumstances, however, it may qualify as a "poor pocket" of land.

Brief #141: Mr. R.J. Ostiguy, Gowling & Henderson (for Ottawa Uplands Limited)

07.2.3.0 16( ) (Point #01)
Supports

This policy has been maintained.

00.0.0.0 00( ) B (Point #02)
Wants to have the extensive employment area designation west of Riverside Drive, south of Hunt Club Bridge changed to allow residential development.

This land has been designated General Urban Area, which permits residential development.

Brief #142: Hon. Stewart McInnes, Minister of Public Works (Canada)

00.0.0.0 00( ) (Point #01)
Acknowledgment only.

Brief #143: Ms. Daphne Wreathem, J.L. Richards and Associates (for Central Canada Exhibition Association)

03.3.3.0 01( ) A (Point #01)
The Central Canada Exhibition Association wish a site in part lots 3 and 4 conc. 1 and part of lot 3 conc. 2 Huntley Ward, Township of West Carleton be designated Major Community Facility on Schedule A. A report detailing the proposal will be submitted at a later date.

Information is required on matters such as the facilities and activities to be located on the proposed Exhibition site, servicing proposals and access to 417 in order to evaluate this proposal. As this information is not yet available, the request will have to be considered separately, and if it is acceptable will be the subject of a separate amendment.

Brief #144: Ms. May Nickson, Council of Women of Ottawa and Area

01.7.2.7 00( ) (Point #01)
Concerned it is costly and inefficient for the different levels of government to each have their own plans.

The different levels of government each have different interests and levels of detail in their respective plans. A given subject is usually covered in detail in only one document, e.g. the NCC has a detailed management plan for the greenbelt; the revised official plan adopted by Regional Council has less than one page on the greenbelt and only two policies. A conscious effort was made in the revised regional official plan to include only that level of detail required to protect explicitly defined regional interests.

01.7.2.7 00( ) (Point #02)
Recommend that regional government should take on the role of coordinating the other sectors of government.

It is not legally possible for the regional government to coordinate either the provincial or federal governments. The Region does play a coordinating role among the eleven area municipalities; the regional official plan is an important mechanism for the coordination of land use planning and related provision of public works.

03.4.3.0 01( ) (Point #03)
The regional plan might not be giving enough attention to the probability of changed life style patterns e.g. Neighbourhood Computer Centres.

It is difficult to judge the probability of lifestyle changes. However, the revised official plan adopted by Regional Council does not place any obstacles in the path of such changes. For example, policies for General Urban Areas permit a mix of uses including small-scale employment (up to 2,000 jobs in any single discrete cluster); this will easily accommodate the development of neighbourhood computer centres.

03.4.3.0 02( ) (Point #04)
Support for more walk and bike paths.

Major Bicycle Corridors are designated on Schedule F of the official plan adopted by Regional Council. In addition, the Plan calls for compact and pedestrian oriented development at transitway stations and stresses provision for safe and convenient pedestrian and bicycle travel in General Urban Areas.

03.4.3.0 07( ) (Point #05)
Suggests park land be provided around transit stations mainly as a noise buffer. Child care facilities should be provided close to transit stations.

The official plan adopted by Regional Council requires that community facilities, including day care centres, be located close to transit service. The Plan also promotes increased development in the vicinity of transitway stations to extend the benefits of transitway service to the maximum number of people. Park lands immediately adjacent to transitway stations would be inconsistent with this approach and would increase walking distances to the stations.

06.2.6.0 12( ) (Point #06)
RMOC should take responsibility for ensuring that emergency housing and homes for special needs are available.

The policies adopted by Council require it to provide emergency housing (policy 13) and promote a more even distribution of group homes by requiring that zoning by-laws permit them in all areas where primarily residential uses are permitted.

06.2.6.0 12( ) (Point #07)
Housing for special needs groups should be distributed over the greater Ottawa-Carleton area.

The policy adopted by Council (policy 12) promotes a more even distribution of group homes by requiring that zoning by-laws permit them in all areas where primarily residential uses are permitted.

09.1.0.0 00( ) (Point #08)
RMOC should take responsibility for coordinating and improving services to tourists. The provision of lists focusing on views and activities would be a part of this.

This is not a matter which can be dealt with by the official plan.

09.3.0.0 06( ) (Point #09)
The old Teachers College should incorporate meeting space for medium sized meetings of public groups.

This specific design suggestion does not belong in an official plan.

Brief #145: Mr. P. Bourgault, Ottawa Health Sciences Centre Inc.

11.2.2.0 00( ) (Point #01)
Concern about traffic in the vicinity of the hospitals on Smyth Road. The D.S. Lea study

recommendations should be implemented as soon as possible.

Some or all of the recommendations of the D.S. Lea study may be conditions for implementation as the Hospital Complex expands. This is a normal approach to dealing with major developments.

Brief #146: Mr. Bill Grant, Ministry of Northern Development and Mines (Ontario)

05.2.7.0 10( ) (Point #01)
The Ministry of Northern Development and Mines should be referenced rather than the Ministry of Natural Resources.

This has been done.

Brief #147: Mr. Donald C. Johnston, Kingdon Holdings Limited

00.0.0.0 00( ) A (Point #01)
The Township of West Carleton, Fitzroy Ward, lots 13 and 14. Request for land to be designated General Rural Area rather than Agricultural Resource. The land previously had a subdivision which was draft-approved and which has been allowed to lapse. Streets have been cleared and grubbed, test wells have been installed and passed. Although it is within an agricultural area, it is not good agricultural land.

The size of this area within a large agricultural area means it would qualify as a "poor pocket" where 2 ha severances could be permitted. It is too small to warrant a General Rural designation.

Brief #148: Mr. John Reid, City of Gloucester

02.2.0.0 03( ) (Point #01)
The study that is referred to is not necessary as official plan amendments 10 and 11 have already been adopted. The joint study is required to deal with regional services.

The policy in the May 1987 draft Plan which called for a planning study by the Region, Region jointly with the Cities of Nepean and Gloucester, has been replaced in the revised official plan adopted by Regional Council by a policy which requires approval of an amendment to the regional official plan to establish policies or the South Urban Centre at a similar level of detail to those for the Kanata and Orleans urban centres as well as amendments to the Nepean and Gloucester official plans. In June 1988 Council approved a Strategic Transportation Study for the South Urban Centre, an example of a joint study to deal with services.

Brief #149: Ms. Vicki Mason, Taxpayers Association of Ottawa-Carleton

02.2.0.0 02( ) (Point #01)
The reference to "policies elsewhere in this Plan" should be spelled out and not left to interpretation.

The cross-reference to other policies in the Plan remains in the revised official plan adopted by Regional Council. The other policies which might potentially qualify the approval for development are too numerous to list specifically. Policy 3 in Part 2 which requires approval of an amendment to the regional official plan to establish policies for the South Urban Centre and Leitrim at a

similar level of detail to those for the Kanata and Orleans urban centres is an important one. However, specific sites may also be affected by policies concerning flood plains, airport noise or availability of road capacity, to name a few examples. It is important that the Plan be read in its entirety.

02.2.0.0 03( ) (Point #02)
If more time is required for the planning of the SUC the time should be taken now. The region has a responsibility to guide development.

Policy 3 in Part 2 of the revised official plan adopted by Regional Council requires approval of an amendment to the regional official plan to establish policies for the South Urban Centre at a similar level of detail to those for the Kanata and Orleans urban centres as well as amendments to the Nepean and Gloucester official plans.

02.2.0.0 06( ) (Point #03)
This policy is ambiguous. It may mean the local municipality can build the services rather than the regional government.

Policy 6 of the May 1987 draft and the revised official plan adopted by Regional Council addresses the issue of where municipal piped services may be extended and not who will extend them. However, Policy 1 in Part 10, which establishes priorities for the extension of trunk sewers, was deliberately worded to affect only funding by Regional Council for sewer improvements, leaving the option open for funding either by an area municipality or private developer.

Brief #150: A.S. Harris, CP Rail
07.2.3.0 17( ) (Point #01)
CP Rail objects to residential development adjacent to its right of way. It lists a number of conditions which should be imposed on such development.

This is best handled at the time plans of subdivision are being considered.

Brief #151: Ms. Grace Strachan, Ministry of Municipal Affairs (Ontario)
06.2.4.0 00( ) (Point #01)
The Ministry of Municipal Affairs would like reference to encouraging municipalities to adopt and implement community improvement plans in all older areas.

Council adopted Policy 10 (Section 6.2.4) which "encourages area municipalities to adopt and implement community improvement plans...to upgrade and improve established areas".

Brief #152: Ms. Kathryn Davidson, Novatech Engineering Consultants Ltd. (for Del Corporation)
00.0.0.0 00( ) (Point #01)
Asks for scheduled time at public meeting.

Brief #153: Messrs. G.M. Lindberg and P. Korwin-Szymankowski, Alta Vista Drive Residents Association
00.0.0.0 00( ) C1 (Point #01)
Objects to Alta Vista Drive being shown as an existing regional road on schedule C1.

Alta Vista Drive has been deleted from Schedule C1 in the official plan adopted by

Regional Council.

11.2.1.0 00( ) (Point #02)
Objects to the statement that "most regional roads eventually will be constructed or reconstructed to 4 or 6 lanes.

It is a fact that most regional roads in the urban area will be constructed or reconstructed to 4 or 6 lanes. This statement does not mean that there cannot be a 2 lane regional road.

11.2.1.0 03( ) (Point #03)
Objects to the policy "regional roads designated on schedule C1 and D1 shall be designed, built and operated to carry traffic of all types".

As the regional road system, which carries 50% of the traffic on 25% of the lane kilometrage, is primarily for the movement of people and goods, it is a fundamental requirement that it be designed, built and operated to carry all types of traffic.

11.2.2.0 00( ) (Point #04)
Support for Alta Vista Parkway as a Tier 1 facility to reduce the traffic load on Alta Vista Drive.

There is no "tiering" of road improvements in the official plan adopted by Regional Council. Council will determine the priority of improvements to the regional road system in its five-year capital budget forecast in the context of monitoring reports and other indicators of need.

Brief #154: Mrs. J.K. Heggart, AMCT, Township of Rideau

02.2.0.0 03( ) (Point #01)
This policy should be amended to include the Township of Rideau as a participant in the study.

The policy in the May 1987 draft which called for a planning study by the Region, jointly with the Cities of Nepean and Gloucester, has been replaced in the revised official plan adopted by Regional Council by a policy which requires approval of an amendment to the regional official plan to establish policies for the South Urban Centre at a similar level of detail to those for the Kanata and Orleans urban centres as well as amendments to the Nepean and Gloucester official plans. Since the reference to a joint planning study has been deleted, the Township of Rideau cannot be included as a participant. Rideau Township will have to deal directly with the Cities of Nepean and Gloucester.

04.2.2.0 08( ) (Point #02)
Should be amended to provide for a 20-year planning period rather than a 10 year planning period for village plans.

Local municipalities may choose a twenty year period if they wish.

04.2.2.0 10( ) (Point #03)
The Township questions whether the policy requiring hydrogeology studies to consider land within 2 km of a village is a reasonable and practical requirement.

It is important that village development not adversely affect wells in the vicinity. The two kilometre distance is only "approximate".

04.2.3.0 14(b) (Point #04)
Objects to requiring the Township to establish its own quota.

This requirement has been deleted.

04.2.3.0 15( ) (Point #05)
Rideau would have to amend its official plan to permit smaller lots in association with a golf course or other recreational facility.

This is optional for the municipality.

04.2.5.0 19( ) (Point #06)
Multiple unit development should also be permitted in general rural areas rather than be restricted to villages.

Permitting multiple unit development in General Rural Areas would not be in the interests of maintaining the rural area as a location characterised by large lot, low density development.

05.1.3.1 01(e) (Point #07)
The policy towards industrial and commercial uses is too restrictive.

To reduce loss of good land and potential conflicts with farm operations, only those uses that assist the agricultural economy should locate in Agricultural Resource Areas.

05.1.3.2 03( ) (Point #08)
The proposed severance policies are too restrictive. It is suggested one lot per holding be permitted for retirement and one for farm help during the planning period and that 10 years of farming should be used as the basis for defining a farmer.

Provision for both retirement lots and farm help lots is made. To ensure that retirement lots go only to those who have given a substantial commitment to farming, a twenty year period has been maintained.

05.1.3.3 00( ) (Point #09)
The policy on pockets of poor land is too restrictive. Lot sizes of 0.8 to 4 hectares should be permitted.

The official plan adopted by Regional Council permits lot sizes of 2 hectares or more.

07.2.1.0 06( ) (Point #10)
There is support for this policy however it is unclear as to whether it applies to existing lots of record only and who will assess the hydrogeology report to determine its technical accuracy.

This policy is not restricted to lots of record. The hydrological impact would be assessed by the conservation authorities.

10.1.2.0 06( ) (Point #11)
A more flexible policy should be included to enable local council's discretion in applying for regional plan amendment for the extension of

services to a village whether or not a health problem exists.

Due to the cost involved and because extension of services will create pressures for urban growth not in accord with the overall regional growth strategy, the extension of services to villages should be undertaken only if essential for public health and only if remedial measures for individual wells and/or septic tank systems would not be feasible.

10.1.2.0 10( ) (Point #12)
This is too onerous and will affect the rate of development in villages significantly. Phasing should be left to the discretion of local municipalities.

The policy has been changed firstly to increase 35 lots to 40, secondly to make it clear that this limit only applies to registration of lots. Draft approved plans may exceed 40 lots.

Brief #155: Mr. Allan Gregory, Carlingwood Community Association

03.2.3.1 03( ) (Point #01)
Carlingwood Shopping Centre and Fairlawn Plaza should be treated as a single entity for planning purposes.

The official plan adopted by Regional Council does not treat Carlingwood Shopping Centre and Fairlawn Plaza as a single entity. Carlingwood Shopping Centre is designated as a Regional Shopping Centre on Schedule B of the Region's revised Official Plan. Fairlawn Plaza is, in Section 3.2.3.2, a Community Shopping Centre. It would not be appropriate to treat Fairlawn Plaza differently from other Community Shopping Centres simply because it is located adjacent to a Regional Shopping Centre.

03.2.3.1 03( ) (Point #02)
The City of Ottawa and/or the Regional Municipality of Ottawa-Carleton should not permit the Carlingwood/Fairlawn complex to expand any further.

Section 3.2.3.1 of the Region's revised Official Plan does not establish a gross leasable area ceiling for Carlingwood Shopping Centre. This matter is under study by the City of Ottawa. Trilea Centres Inc. has agreed not to submit any site plan proposal for a period of eighteen months while the City completes its study.

Brief #156: Mr. Michael Noonan, Ottawa-Carleton Home Builders Association

01.3.0.0 00( ) (Point #01)
The analysis of staff contained on pages 193-200 (of the staff report of 27 November 1987) is flawed in the most basic sense. Mr. Stamm's conclusions, based in part upon demographic statistics over the 1981-1985 period, a five year interval ignored by staff, and through dialogue with the developer-builders active in the market are appropriate and represent the minimum in ensuring the smooth function of one of the Region's most important and active industrial sectors.

The high growth of the 1981-1986 period is acknowledged. What staff argued and Council accepted is that a long term projection should not be based solely on recent experience. The underlying factors of the age structure of the population and the prospects for job creation must be examined. Both of these factors indi-

cate a likely lessening of housing demand in the later decades of the projection period, once the baby boom is through the household formation stage. CMHC has reached similar conclusions in its projections of housing requirements.

02.1.6.0 11( ) (Point #02)
The region's Management Committee makes reference to the projected tightness of the land market up to 1995.

The reference in the Management Committee report to "projected tightness in the land supply" refers to the supply of serviced land, not to the overall supply of designated land. Council is moving with all possible speed to construct the Watts Creek relief system and expand and add secondary treatment to the Green Creek Pollution Control Centre in order to increase the supply of serviced land.

Brief #157: Mr. Barry Lithwick, Lithwick Brothers

00.0.0.0 00( ) B (Point #01)
Propose to build an office development at 1655 Carling Avenue.

A Secondary Employment Centre designation at Carling Ave. and the Queensway appeared in the May 1987 version of the Region's draft Official Plan. The Official Plan adopted by Regional Council gives local municipalities responsibility of designating Secondary Employment Centres in their respective official plans, subject to criteria established in the Region's Official Official Plan. As such, the City of Ottawa will ultimately decide the location and extent of a Secondary Employment Centre designation in the vicinity of 1655 Carling Avenue.

Brief #158: Mr. R. Imbeault, Transport Canada

00.0.0.0 00( ) G (Point #01)
Transport Canada proposes in the future to develop a parallel runway in the vicinity of Leitrim Road which will affect RMOC's plans for development in the Leitrim area.

The Aircraft Noise Zone of the Plan adopted by Council assumes the addition of the second parallel runway. The policies specify how and under what conditions development can proceed in the "Airport Noise Zone" associated with Ottawa International Airport.

Brief #159: Mr. Michael Noonan, Minto Construction Limited

00.0.0.0 00( ) C1 (Point #01)
Concern that the Blackburn Hamlet Bypass extension on Schedule C1 will result in a freeze on the development of residential land south of Innes Road until the route of the bypass is fixed.

The location of the Blackburn Hamlet Bypass Extension (Navan Road to Trim Road) has been moved southward to the vicinity of the Hydro Corridor on Schedule C1. Proposed regional roads are shown on Schedule C1 in approximate locations only. Studies will be initiated as soon as possible to determine the precise location and property requirements, so that development south of Innes Road will not be unduly delayed.

Brief #160: Mr. Wayne Robinson, Township of Osgoode

04.2.2.0 10(d) (Point #01)
The 2-kilometre reference appears arbitrary. The scope of hydrogeology studies should be left to the professional expertise of qualified hydrogeologists and of the approval agencies.

The policy refers to "approximately" two kilometres so the distance can be varied according to local conditions.

04.2.3.0 14(b) (Point #02)
Council does not agree that local municipalities should be required to institute their own lot quota system.

This requirement has been deleted.

04.2.4.0 00( ) (Point #03)
Infill development should be treated in the same way as country lot development, i.e. may be permitted by designation or by criteria.

Agree. This has been provided for in the official plan adopted by Regional Council.

04.2.3.0 13( ) (Point #04)
Non-residential uses to be permitted in general rural areas should be the same as permitted in the marginal resource areas of the existing regional plan.

There is no substantive change in the policies from those in the existing Plan.

05.1.3.1 01(g) (Point #05)
This policy is considered to be overly restrictive. Rehabilitation plans should permit other uses as well as productive agricultural uses.

The policy does not restrict the after use to agriculture but says that if the site was initially good agricultural land it should be returned to that potential.

05.1.3.2 03( ) (Point #06)
The proposed severance policies are too restrictive. Future as well as existing farmers should be able to obtain a retirement severance after 10 years or a farm help severance. Such severances should be on poor pockets of land wherever possible. Such lots should be kept as small as possible, 0.4-0.8 hectares, and such severances should be allowed by designation or by criteria.

Provision has been made for farm help severances and for retirement severances provided that lots for these purposes have not already been taken from the holding. To ensure that retirement lots go only to those who have given a substantial commitment to farming, a twenty year period has been maintained. The policies recognize that whenever possible such severances should be on land of low capability. The size of such severances may be determined by local official plans.

05.2.7.3 00( ) (Point #07)
Residential uses should be possible as a use for a worked-out pit or quarry if the land would otherwise be designated general rural area. Council agrees that residential development should not be permitted where the land would

otherwise be designated agricultural resource area.

Housing on worked-out pit or quarry sites in Mineral Resource Areas may sterilize the surrounding deposit.

10.1.2.0 10( ) (Point #08)
The provision to limit plans of subdivision or phases of plans of subdivision to 35 lots is too onerous. In practice it will cause a delay of up to 2 years.

The policy has been changed first to increase 35 lots to 40, secondly to make it clear that this limit only applies to registration of lots. Draft approved plans may exceed 40 lots.

00.0.0.0 00( ) A (Point #09)
The Agricultural Resource Area designation in concs. 2, 3, 8, 9, 10 and 11 north of Regional Road 6 may require some modifications, depending on how the policy issues referred to are resolved.

There was no change in the Agricultural Resource Area designation in these locations in the official plan adopted by Regional Council.

00.0.0.0 00( ) A (Point #10)
There is an existing draft approved country lot subdivision located in the proposed agricultural resource area in concession 3 Township of Osgoode.

The designation does not negate approved subdivisions.

00.0.0.0 00( ) A (Point #11)
There is no apparent rationale for including the small area in concession 2 west of the rail line Township of Osgoode in the agricultural resource area.

This has been changed to General Rural.

Brief #161: (Various Individuals), Residents Living near Carlingwood Shopping Centre

03.2.3.1 03( ) (Point #01)
[A petition]. Support for the position that there should be no further expansion of the Carlingwood Shopping Centre and Fairlawn Plaza properties on grounds of traffic congestion, loss of safety of pedestrians, cyclists and motorists, increased air and noise pollution, loss of enjoyment of property and neighbourhood facilities, loss of property values, loss of sense of community and an overall diminished quality of life.

Section 3.2.3.1 of the Region's revised Official Plan does not establish a gross leasable area ceiling for Carlingwood Shopping Centre. The City of Ottawa is doing a zoning review. Trilea Centres Inc. has agreed not to submit any site plan proposal for a period of eighteen months while the City completes its study. When study results are available, Regional Council will establish a limit for Carlingwood..

Brief #162: Mr. J.R. Cyr, City of Ottawa

05.0.0.0 00( ) (Point #01)
City of Ottawa supports the Region's interests, objectives and policies in Part 5.

This policy direction has been maintained.

06.0.0.0 00( ) (Point #02)
The City of Ottawa supports the Region's interests, objectives and policies in Part 6.

There have been only minor changes to the interests, objectives and policies in Part 6.

07.0.0.0 00( ) (Point #03)
The City of Ottawa supports the region's interest, objectives and policies in part 7 except for policy 6.

Policy 6 a) has been reworded.

07.2.1.0 06(a) (Point #04)
The policy should be amended to delete the words "the zoning by-law passed by".

The zoning by-law must contain the requirement for a permit under the "fill, construction and alteration of waterways" regulations or a building permit might be issued without consideration of flood plain impacts.

08.0.0.0 00( ) (Point #05)
City of Ottawa supports the region's interest, objectives and policies in part 8.

This section has not been changed.

09.0.0.0 00( ) (Point #06)
The City of Ottawa supports the region's interests objectives and policies in Part 9.

The interests, objectives and policies are largely unchanged.

10.0.0.0 00( ) (Point #07)
The City of Ottawa supports the region's interests, objectives and policies in part 10.

The Plan adopted by Council retains these interests, objectives and policies.

07.0.0.0 00( ) (Point #08)
The City of Ottawa asks that the region ask the province to confirm the policy change to recognise the flood fringe under the Planning Act.

This is not a matter that can be effected through an official plan.

07.0.0.0 00( ) (Point #09)
The City of Ottawa asks that the region ask the Conservation Authority to define regulations for the flood fringe.

This is not a matter that can be effected through an official plan.

07.0.0.0 00( ) (Point #10)
The City of Ottawa indicated that the City will seek eventual delegation of the administration of regulations within the flood plain within the City of Ottawa.

This is noted.

01.7.2.0 09( )

(Point #11)
The region should define an effective monitoring system that includes and relies heavily upon the regional housing statement and its updates.

In the revised official plan adopted by Regional Council, a new policy has been added to Part 1 as follows:
"In order to facilitate the review of this Plan, Council will monitor the achievement of its objectives and effectiveness of its policies".
In addition, the May 1987 draft and the Plan as adopted by Regional Council detail Council's commitment to preparation of Regional Housing Statement Updates and Annual Housing Reviews. Work is underway on defining the monitoring system.

00.0.0.0 00( ) B

(Point #12)
The region should not designate secondary employment centres on Schedule B.

Secondary Employment Centre designations are no longer shown on Schedule B. The Official Plan adopted by Council permits local municipalities to designate Secondary Employment Centres in their respective Official Plans subject to criteria established in the Region's Official Plan.

00.0.0.0 00( ) B

(Point #13)
If the Region does not delete secondary employment centres from Schedule B, the following secondary employment centres should be added to Schedule B: 1) Innes Road and St. Laurent Blvd. 2) City Hall, National Research Council and External Affairs and the following secondary employment centre should be deleted from Schedule B: 1) Carlingwood Mall.

Secondary Employment Centre designations are no longer shown in Schedule B. The Official Plan adopted by Council permits local municipalities to designate Secondary Employment Centres in their respective Official Plans provided that the Secondary Employment Centres so designated meet the criteria established in the Region's Official Plan.

03.1.3.2 04( )

(Point #14)
Housing units should be permitted and encouraged in primary employment centres where the surrounding area offers a suitable environment for residential development.

High density residential development is permitted in Primary Employment Centres provided the opportunity to accommodate employment is not reduced below the levels established for Primary Employment Centres in the revised Official Plan adopted by Regional Council (Section 3.1.3.2).

03.1.3.3 08( )

(Point #15)
Housing units should be permitted and encouraged in secondary employment centres where the surrounding area offers a suitable environment for residential development.

High density residential development is permitted in Secondary Employment Centres designated in local official plans provided the opportunity to accommodate employment is not reduced below

the levels established for Secondary Employment Centres in the Region's Official Plan.

03.2.3.1 03( ) (Point #16)
The region should define a maximum gross leaseable area for regional shopping centres within the greenbelt exclusive of the central area and the size of individual centres should be defined by the local municipality based on such factors as the site size of the centre, capacity of the infrastructure to support the development, access and neighbourhood context.

The official plan adopted by Regional Council establishes a maximum gross leasable area of 70,000 sq. m for the Bayshore, St. Laurent and South Keys regional shopping centres. No maximum was established for Carlingwood, pending further study by the City of Ottawa.

00.0.0.0 00( ) C1 (Point #17)
The future status of Lenester & Fairlawn Avenues within the regional road system should be considered, following the outcome of the study into alternatives to the present function these roads perform.

Lenester and Fairlawn have been reviewed in the 1988 Road Classification Update and it is recommended that they remain in the Regional Road System. The discontinuity of Woodroffe Avenue at Carling requires that the current Regional road network remain in place. Until Woodroffe is realigned, the present status will continue to be recommended.

00.0.0.0 00( ) C1 (Point #18)
That the Region not try to seek approval of the following roads to be part of the regional road system and shown on Schedule C1 until such time as the Road Classification Review is considered.
1) Prince of Wales (Carling to Highway 16)
2) Somerset Street (from Bronson to Elgin)
3) Parkdale Avenue.

Prince of Wales Drive, Somerset Street and Parkdale Avenue are all included in Schedule C1 of the official plan adopted by Regional Council. Prince of Wales Drive, Somerset Street and Parkdale Avenue have been reviewed in the 1988 System Review and it is recommended that they continue to remain in the Regional Road System.

00.0.0.0 00( ) C1 (Point #19)
That Kirkwood Avenue between Scott Street and Richmond Road be subject to approval only after a full review of the need for the extension is completed and potential changes to the status of other regional roads in the area have been identified.

The Kirkwood Avenue extension is included in the official plan adopted by Regional Council. This project is considered necessary to carry future traffic volumes in this area. The need (and timing) for the extension is primarily dependent on the timing of high density development on lands north of Scott Street. It will be appropriate to carry out detailed studies to address such issues as need, implications for the remainder of the Regional road system etc. when the facility is being recommended for inclusion in the Region's Capital Works Program.

11.2.1.0 4 ( )

(Point #20)
Policy 4 should be amended to read, "Council shall pass a by-law to specify the right-of-way for each regional road, which includes land for uses other than the roadway (such as pedestrian facilities, bicycle lanes, noise abatement, utilities) such by-law being subject to amendment from time to time".

Policy 4 has not been amended in the official plan adopted by Regional Council. Rights-of-way traditionally include land for pedestrian facilities and utilities. The text of section 11.2.1 has been amended to state that "where appropriate and feasible" rights-of-way for regional roads should also "include sufficient space to accommodate noise abatement measures and bicycle paths".

11.2.2.0 05( )

(Point #21)
The following should be added to policy 5 "a monitoring system will be established to identify the characteristics that would increase the need for improvements to Tier 2 roads earlier than anticipated or decrease the need for improvements. Should circumstances warrant, an amendment will be initiated to change the status of a road(s) from Tier 2 to Tier 1 or from Tier 1 1 to Tier 2 or when improvements are no longer required.

There is no "tiering" of road improvements in the official plan adopted by Regional Council. Council will determine the priority of improvements to the regional road system in its five-year capital budget forecast in the context of monitoring reports and other indicators of need.

11.3.0.0 09( )

(Point #22)
Policy 9 should be amended as follows "Regional Council shall participate with other levels of government in a study to determine the need for and location of additional road crossings of the Ottawa River. Pending the outcome of the study, Council shall protect, in cooperation with the NCC and other federal departments approaches to"

Although the wording is not identical, the substance of this comment has been incorporated in the official plan adopted by Regional Council.

11.4.1.0 15(c)

(Point #23)
Policy 15c should be amended to read "an arrangement of development and streets whereby the users of the building generally are within walking distance to transit service or where transit service can be provided and walking distance to transit service are minimised by i) locating high density development closer to existing or proposed transit stops and lower density development, ii) providing paved pedestrian paths to reduce walking distances where the road system does not achieve standard of 400 metres.

Policy 15 c) of Part 2 in the official plan adopted by Regional Council refers to "virtually all potential building sites" (the words "virtually all" do permit some flexibility) and continues to refer specifically to a walking distance of 400 metres to transit service.

11.4.2.0 20( ) (Point #24)
Policy 20 should be deleted and replaced by the following, "when approving or considering local official plans and amendments, Council will ensure that area municipalities encourage a high level of use of the transitway. This may be accomplished by the local municipality identifying through detailed planning studies the appropriate arrangement and intensity of development and provision of pedestrian access at transitway stations."

This policy has been reworded, but not exactly as requested. The proposed wording would have limited Council's actions to the approval or consideration of local official plans or amendments thereto. Subdivisions, zoning and site plan approval may also provide opportunities to influence the situation.

11.4.3.0 21( ) (Point #25)
Policy 21 should be deleted from the draft official plan. In its place the region should define an ongoing monitoring system to investigate possible transitway extensions.

This policy (now policy 23) has been retained in the official plan adopted by Regional Council. The transportation analysis undertaken as part of the official plan review identified the possible need for the four transitways identified in the policy. Work on identifying potential corridors and alignments has not yet been done. However, it is considered important to raise the possibility in the official plan so opportunities are not precluded in the future. Because routes have not been investigated the alignments cannot be designated on a schedule. Identifying the corridors in general terms as is done in policy 23 is thought to be the best course of action.

11.5.0.0 22( ) (Point #25)
Policy 22 should be amended as follows "Council recognizes bicycles as a form of transportation for commuting and recreation on existing and proposed regional roads, in new transitway corridors and regional utility corridors where appropriate. Where feasible, regional roads shall be adapted to provide safer travel for bicycles. Council will not support the use of bicycles in bus lanes on regional roads".

This policy has been amended in the official plan adopted by Regional Council, to include reference to transitway corridors and utility corridors.

00.0.0.0 00( ) F (Point #27)
Schedule F should be amended to extend the major bicycle corridor south on Conroy Road to Hunt Club Road.

This does not require an amendment to Schedule F of the official plan. Moreover, the Transportation Department is preparing a report of how cyclists' needs can be better accommodated on regional roads. Until this report is issued, it would be premature to designate additional bicycle corridors in the official plan.

OFFICIAL PLAN REVIEW - PHASE III
SUBMISSIONS RECEIVED -- IN ALPHABETICAL ORDER BY AUTHOR

No.	Author	Brief Location V.	Brief Location Page	Summary Location Page
	INDIVIDUALS			
47	Mr. Brian Arbuckle	A	289	38
19	Mr. Max Bacon	A	52	13
117	Ms. Bueno	C	723	92
64	Mr. Burritt Collins	B	389	50
11	Mr. Reginald Faulkner	A	20	5
138	Colleen Findlay	C	834	110
52	Mr. Bob Avery & Mrs. Ghislaine Brunet	A	307	39
108	Mr. Bob Avery & Mrs. Ghislaine Brunet	C	676	87
21	Mr. Allan R. Gregory	A	55	14
102	Mr. Allan R. Gregory	C	666	86
128	Ms. Marey Gregory	C	798	103
140	Mrs. Lillian Hobbs	C	838	110
59	Mr. Ken Hubert	B	339	43
110	Mrs. Helen Johansen	C	710	89
137	Mr.& Mrs. F.D. Lute	C	833	109
135	Mr. Howard Maguire	C	813	108
5	Mr. David Makow	A	6	1
26	Lambert McCarthy	A	99	17
6	Mrs. Barbara McGee	A	8	2
101	Mrs. Barbara McGee	C	662	85
122	Mr. W.P. McKinley	C	742	97
10	Mr. John K. Murphy	A	15	2
9	Mr. M.J. O'Connor	A	12	2
22	Messrs. Allan R. Gregory & Paul M. Laughton	A	63	14
15	Mr. Algirdas Povilonis	A	36	6
34	Mr. Alan Rackow, P.Eng.	A	223	25
118	Mme. Monique Riese	C	732	93
90	Dr. R. Sinha	B	588	78
56	Mr. Ralph Spratt	B	322	40
80	Mr. John Teevens	B	513	66
120	Mr. Barry Wellar, PhD, MCIP	C	735	94
132	Ms. L. Westell	C	802	105
	ORGANIZATIONS			
*	Where the author of a brief submitted on behalf of a client, the brief is listed twice, by submitter and by client name.			
68	511376 Ontario Limited	B	402	52
91	Action Alta Vista Parkway	B	590	79
153	Alta Vista Drive Residents' Association	C	879	114
35	Arnon Development Corporation (per Soloway, Wright, et. al.)	A	224	25
115	Arnon Development Corporation (per Soloway, Wright, et. al.)	C	720	90
94	Bell, Baker (for Fine's Flowers Ltd.)	B	619	81
71	Bradley Family (per Marion Seymour, Consultant)	B	447	57
33	Messrs. Bradley et. al. (per Proctor & Redfern Group)	A	220	24
150	CP Rail	C	875	114
46	Campeau Corporation (per Soloway, Wright et.al.)	A	287	37
63	Campeau Corporation (per Soloway, Wright et.al.)	B	388	48
95	Campeau Corporation (per Soloway, Wright et.al.)	B	621	82
17	Canterbury Community Association	A	38	6
77	Carleton Condominium Corporation #11	B	500	65
79	Carlingwood Action Committee	B	505	66
109	Carlingwood Action Committee	C	704	88
155	Carlingwood Community Association	C	887	117
114	Cave Investments (per Soloway, Wright, et. al.)	C	718	90
67	Cedarlane Estates	B	396	52
131	Central Canada Exhibition (per J.L. Richards & Assoc. Ltd.)	C	801	105

No.	Author	Brief Location V.	Brief Location Page	Summary Location Page
143	Central Canada Exhibition (per J.L. Richards & Assoc. Ltd.)	C	848	111
24	Churchill Area Residents' Association	A	82	15
78	Churchill Area Residents' Association	B	503	66
18	Citizens for Safe Cycling	A	41	9
43	City of Gloucester	A	271	31
148	City of Gloucester	C	871	113
8	City of Kanata	A	11	2
29	City of Kanata	A	108	19
51	City of Nepean	A	299	38
73	City of Nepean	B	462	57
162	City of Ottawa	C	919	121
53	City of Vanier	B	310	39
139	City of Vanier	C	835	110
104	Coates, Edward (per Winter Buchanan Associates)	C	668	86
123	Consumers Gas	C	744	97
130	Council of Women of Ottawa and Area	C	800	104
144	Council of Women of Ottawa and Area	C	851	111
23	Craig, Mr. & Mrs. Eldon (per Low, Murchison)	A	74	15
76	Cummings Cockburn Limited (for Elsett Realty)	B	493	64
70	Cummings Cockburn Limited (for Richcraft Homes)	B	434	56
32	Davidson et. al., Messrs. (per Proctor & Redfern Group)	A	196	24
152	Del Corporation (per Novatech Engineering Consultants Ltd.)	C	878	114
37	Del Corporation (per Soloway, Wright, et. al.)	A	235	26
76	Elsett Realty (per Cummings Cockburn Limited)	B	493	64
60	Environment Blackburn	B	340	43
57	Environment Canada Parks	B	323	40
14	Environment Canada	A	25	6
112	Famlit Investments et. al (per Soloway, Wright, et. al.)	C	714	90
66	Federation of Citizens Associations	B	394	50
94	Fine's Flowers Limited (per Bell, Baker)	B	619	81
83	Glabar Park Community Association	B	530	67
141	Gowling & Henderson (for Ottawa Uplands Limited)	C	840	110
136	Gloucester Equestrian Centre Limited (per Scott & Aylen)	C	815	108
98	Hampton-Iona Community Group	C	644	84
127	Highland Park Ratepayers' Association	C	795	102
99	Holitzner, M. Limited (per Proctor & Redfern Group)	C	646	84
40	Ivanhoe Incorporated (per Soloway, Wright et.al.)	A	260	29
54	J. Freedman et. al (per Equity Management International Ltd.)	B	318	40
131	J.L. Richards & Assoc. Ltd. (for Central Canada Exhibition)	C	801	105
143	J.L. Richards & Assoc. Ltd. (for Central Canada Exhibition)	C	848	111
27	Jockvale Realty (per Proctor & Redfern Group)	A	101	18
42	Kimmel, Victor & Ages (for Tanglewood Ottawa Ltd.)	A	263	31
44	Kingdon Holdings Limited	A	284	37
147	Kingdon Holdings Limited	C	870	113
48	Landowners of Lots 10-15, Con. I, Huntley	A	291	38
111	Limebank Holdings	C	714	89
157	Lithwick Bros.	C	890	118
23	Low, Murchison (for Mr. and Mrs. Eldon Craig)	A	74	15
38	M.M. Dillon Ltd. (for Shenkman Corporation)	A	235	26
71	Marion Seymour, Consultant (for the Bradley Family)	B	447	57
72	Marion Seymour, Consultant	B	460	57
105	Marion Seymour, Consultant	C	670	86
142	Minister of Public Works (Canada)	C	844	111
2	Minister of Public Works (Canada)	A	2	1
65	Minto Construction Limited	B	390	50
159	Minto Construction Limited	C	892	118
13	Mississippi Valley Conservation Authority	A	22	5
3	National Capital Commission	A	3	1
125	National Capital Commission	C	783	97

No.	Author	Brief Location V.	Brief Location Page	Summary Location Page
82	New Edinburgh Community Association	B	522	67
152	Novatech Engineering Consultants Ltd. (for Del Corporation)	C	878	114
49	Ontario Hydro	A	296	38
86	Ontario Institute of Agrologists - Ottawa Valley Branch	B	542	69
39	Ontario Ministry of Agriculture and Food	A	255	27
106	Ontario Ministry of Citizenship and Culture - Heritage	C	673	86
7	Ontario Ministry of Community and Social Service	A	9	2
1	Ontario Ministry of Education	A	1	1
62	Ontario Ministry of the Environment Southeast Region	B	381	44
50	Ontario Ministry of Housing	A	298	38
107	Ontario Ministry of Housing	C	675	87
96	Ontario Ministry of Municipal Affairs	C	636	82
103	Ontario Ministry of Municipal Affairs	C	667	86
151	Ontario Ministry of Municipal Affairs	C	877	114
16	Ontario Ministry of Natural Resources	A	37	6
116	Ontario Ministry of Natural Resources	C	722	91
146	Ontario Ministry of Northern Development and Mines	C	869	113
4	Ontario Ministry of Transportation and Communications	A	4	1
81	Orleans South Community Association	B	518	66
28	Ottawa East Community Association	A	103	18
126	Ottawa Federation of Housing Cooperatives, Inc.	C	787	100
145	Ottawa Health Sciences Centre Inc.	C	854	112
58	Ottawa Pedestrian Citizens Committee	B	326	41
141	Ottawa Uplands Limited (per Gowling & Henderson)	C	840	110
69	Ottawa-Carleton Home Builders' Association	B	411	52
124	Ottawa-Carleton Home Builders' Association	C	745	97
156	Ottawa-Carleton Home Builders' Association	C	888	117
113	Patterson, Gib (per Soloway, Wright, et. al.)	C	715	90
75	Perley-Robertson, Panet, et.al. (for Terrace Investments)	B	491	64
119	Perley-Robertson, Panet, et.al. (for Terrace Investments)	C	733	93
27	Proctor & Redfern Group (for Jockvale Realty)	A	101	18
32	Proctor & Redfern Group (for Messrs. Davidson et.al)	A	196	24
33	Proctor & Redfern Group (for Messrs. Bradley et.al)	A	220	24
99	Proctor & Redfern Group (for M. Holitzner Limited)	C	646	84
31	Proctor & Redfern Group (for Taysham Investors)	A	133	24
85	Proctor & Redfern Group (for Taysham Investors Inc.)	B	536	69
121	Queenswood Heights Community Association	C	739	94
129	R.A.M.P.	C	799	103
161	Residents near Carlingwood Shopping Centre	C	900	120
70	Richcraft Homes (per Cummings Cockburn Limited)	B	434	56
89	Rideau Front Property Owners	B	578	78
84	Ridgeview Community Association	B	532	68
136	Scott & Aylen (for Gloucester Equestrian Centre Ltd.)	C	815	108
38	Shenkman Corporation (per M.M. Dillon Limited)	A	235	26
35	Soloway, Wright, et. al. (for Arnon Development Corporation)	A	224	25
115	Soloway, Wright, et. al. (for Arnon Development Corporation)	C	720	90
46	Soloway, Wright et.al. (for Campeau Corporation)	A	287	37
63	Soloway, Wright et.al. (for Campeau Corporation)	B	388	48
95	Soloway, Wright et.al. (for Campeau Corporation)	B	621	82
114	Soloway, Wright, et. al. (for Cave Investments)	C	718	90
37	Soloway, Wright, et. al. (for Del Corporation)	A	235	26
112	Soloway, Wright, et. al. (for Famlit Investments et.al.)	C	714	90
113	Soloway, Wright, et. al. (for Gib Patterson)	C	715	90
40	Soloway, Wright et.al. (for Ivanhoe Inc.)	A	260	29
30	Soloway, Wright, et. al. (for John Steenbakkers)	A	123	23
36	Soloway, Wright, et. al. (for John Steenbakkers)	A	225	25
41	Soloway, Wright et.al. (for Trilea Centres Inc.)	A	261	30
30	Steenbakkers, J. (per Soloway, Wright, et. al.)	A	123	23
36	Steenbakkers, J. (per Soloway, Wright, et. al.)	A	225	25

No.	Author	Brief Location V.	Brief Location Page	Summary Location Page
42	Tanglewood Ottawa Limited (per Kimmel, Victor & Ages)	A	263	31
88	Tanglewood Ottawa Limited	B	564	78
20	Tartan Development Corporation	A	54	13
45	Tartan Development Corporation	A	285	37
100	Tartan Development Corporation	C	648	85
93	Taxpayers Association of Ottawa-Carleton	B	608	81
149	Taxpayers Association of Ottawa-Carleton	C	873	113
31	Taysham Investors Incorporated (per Proctor & Redfern Group)	A	133	24
85	Taysham Investors Incorporated (per Proctor & Redfern Group)	B	536	69
75	Terrace Investments Ltd. (Perley-Robertson, Panet, et.al.)	B	491	64
119	Terrace Investments Ltd. (Perley-Robertson, Panet, et.al.)	C	733	93
87	Township of Cumberland	B	547	71
74	Township of Goulbourn	B	480	61
61	Township of Osgoode	B	380	44
160	Township of Osgoode	C	893	119
154	Township of Rideau	C	881	115
134	Township of West Carleton	C	804	107
97	Transport Canada Airport Authority Group	C	643	84
158	Transport Canada	C	891	118
41	Trilea Centres Incorporated (per Soloway, Wright et.al.)	A	261	30
133	Vanier Parkway Extension Committee	C	803	105
55	W.J. Bell & Son Construction Ltd.	B	320	40
12	Welch's Applehill Farm	A	22	5
92	West Carleton Ratepayers Association	B	600	79
25	Westboro Community Association	A	92	16
104	Winter Buchanan Associates (for Edward Coates)	C	668	86

OFFICIAL PLAN REVIEW - PHASE III
SUBMISSIONS RECEIVED -- IN ORDER OF SUBMITTER TYPE

No.	Author	Brief Location V.	Brief Location Page	Summary Location Page
	FEDERAL MINISTRIES AND AGENCIES			
14	Environment Canada	A	25	6
57	Environment Canada Parks	B	323	40
142	Minister of Public Works	C	844	111
2	Minister of Public Works (Canada)	A	2	1
3	National Capital Commission	A	3	1
125	National Capital Commission	C	783	97
158	Transport Canada	C	891	118
97	Transport Canada Airport Authority Group	C	643	84
	LOCAL AGENCIES			
131	J.L. Richards & Assoc. Ltd. (for Central Canada Exhibition)	C	801	105
143	J.L. Richards & Assoc. Ltd. (for Central Canada Exhibition)	C	848	111
13	Mississippi Valley Conservation Authority	A	22	5
145	Ottawa Health Sciences Centre Inc.	C	854	112
	PROVINCIAL MINISTRIES			
39	Ontario Ministry of Agriculture and Food	A	255	27
106	Ontario Ministry of Citizenship and Culture - Heritage	C	673	86
7	Ontario Ministry of Community and Social Services	A	9	2
1	Ontario Ministry of Education	A	1	1
62	Ontario Ministry of the Environment Southeast Region	B	381	44
50	Ontario Ministry of Housing	A	298	38
107	Ontario Ministry of Housing	C	675	87
96	Ontario Ministry of Municipal Affairs	C	636	82
103	Ontario Ministry of Municipal Affairs	C	667	86
151	Ontario Ministry of Municipal Affairs	C	877	114
16	Ontario Ministry of Natural Resources	A	37	6
116	Ontario Ministry of Natural Resources	C	722	91
146	Ontario Ministry of Northern Development and Mines	C	869	113
4	Ontario Ministry of Transportation and Communications	A	4	1
	AREA MUNICIPALITIES			
43	City of Gloucester	A	271	31
148	City of Gloucester	C	871	113
29	City of Kanata	A	108	19
8	City of Kanata	A	11	2
73	City of Nepean	B	462	57
51	City of Nepean	A	299	38
162	City of Ottawa	C	919	121
53	City of Vanier	B	310	39
139	City of Vanier	C	835	110
87	Township of Cumberland	B	547	71
74	Township of Goulbourn	B	480	61
160	Township of Osgoode	C	893	119
61	Township of Osgoode	B	380	44
154	Township of Rideau	C	881	115
134	Township of West Carleton	C	804	107
	UTILITIES			
150	CP Rail	C	875	114
123	Consumers Gas	C	744	97
49	Ontario Hydro	A	296	38

No.	Author	Brief Location V.	Brief Location Page	Summary Location Page
	COMMUNITY ORGANIZATIONS			
91	Action Alta Vista Parkway	B	590	79
153	Alta Vista Drive Residents' Association	C	879	114
17	Canterbury Community Association	A	38	6
77	Carleton Condominium Corporation #11	B	500	65
109	Carlingwood Action Committee	C	704	88
79	Carlingwood Action Committee	B	505	66
155	Carlingwood Community Association	C	887	117
78	Churchill Area Residents' Association	B	503	66
24	Churchill Area Residents' Association	A	82	15
18	Citizens for Safe Cycling	A	41	9
130	Council of Women of Ottawa and Area	C	800	104
144	Council of Women of Ottawa and Area	C	851	111
60	Environment Blackburn	B	340	43
66	Federation of Citizens Associations	B	394	50
83	Glabar Park Community Association	B	530	67
98	Hampton-Iona Community Group	C	644	84
127	Highland Park Ratepayers' Association	C	795	102
48	Landowners of Lots 10-15, Con. I, Huntley	A	291	38
82	New Edinburgh Community Association	B	522	67
86	Ontario Institute of Agrologists - Ottawa Valley Branch	B	542	69
81	Orleans South Community Association	B	518	66
28	Ottawa East Community Association	A	103	18
126	Ottawa Federation of Housing Cooperatives, Inc.	C	787	100
58	Ottawa Pedestrian Citizens Committee	B	326	41
121	Queenswood Heights Community Association	C	739	94
129	R.A.M.P.	C	799	103
89	Rideau Front Property Owners	B	578	78
84	Ridgeview Community Association	B	532	68
93	Taxpayers Association of Ottawa-Carleton	B	608	81
149	Taxpayers Association of Ottawa-Carleton	C	873	113
133	Vanier Parkway Extension Committee	C	803	105
92	West Carleton Ratepayers Association	B	600	79
25	Westboro Community Association	A	92	16
	DEVELOPMENT INTERESTS			
*	Where the author of a brief submitted on behalf of a client, the brief is listed twice, by submitter and by client name.			
68	511376 Ontario Limited	B	402	52
35	Arnon Development Corporation (per Soloway, Wright, et. al.)	A	224	25
115	Arnon Development Corporation (per Soloway, Wright, et. al.)	C	720	90
94	Bell, Baker (for Fine's Flowers Ltd.)	B	619	81
71	Bradley Family (per Marion Seymour, Consultant)	B	447	57
33	Messrs. Bradley et. al. (per Proctor & Redfern Group)	A	220	24
46	Campeau Corporation (per Soloway, Wright et.al.)	A	287	37
63	Campeau Corporation (per Soloway, Wright et.al.)	B	388	48
95	Campeau Corporation (per Soloway, Wright et.al.)	B	621	82
114	Cave Investments (per Soloway, Wright, et. al.)	C	718	90
67	Cedarlane Estates	B	396	52
131	Central Canada Exhibition (per J.L. Richards & Assoc. Ltd.)	C	801	105
143	Central Canada Exhibition (per J.L. Richards & Assoc. Ltd.)	C	848	111
104	Coates, Edward (per Winter Buchanan Associates)	C	668	86
23	Craig, Mr. & Mrs. Eldon (per Low, Murchison)	A	74	15
76	Cummings Cockburn Limited (for Elsett Realty)	B	493	64
70	Cummings Cockburn Limited (for Richcraft Homes)	B	434	56
32	Davidson et. al., Messrs. (per Proctor & Redfern Group)	A	196	24
152	Del Corporation (per Novatech Engineering Consultants Ltd.)	C	878	114
37	Del Corporation (per Soloway, Wright, et. al.)	A	235	26

No.	Author	Brief Location V.	Brief Location Page	Summary Location Page
76	Elsett Realty (per Cummings Cockburn Limited)	B	493	64
54	Equity Management International Limited (for J.Freedman et.al)	B	318	40
112	Famlit Investments et. al (per Soloway, Wright, et. al.)	C	714	90
94	Fine's Flowers Limited (per Bell, Baker)	B	619	81
136	Gloucester Equestrian Centre Limited (per Scott & Aylen)	C	815	108
141	Gowling & Henderson (for Ottawa Uplands Limited)	C	840	110
99	Holitzner, M. Limited (per Proctor & Redfern Group)	C	646	84
40	Ivanhoe Incorporated (per Soloway, Wright et.al.)	A	260	29
54	J. Freedman et. al (per Equity Management International Ltd.)	B	318	40
27	Jockvale Realty (per Proctor & Redfern Group)	A	101	18
42	Kimmel, Victor & Ages (for Tanglewood Ottawa Ltd.)	A	263	31
44	Kingdon Holdings Limited	A	284	37
147	Kingdon Holdings Limited	C	870	113
111	Limebank Holdings	C	714	90
157	Lithwick Bros.	C	890	118
38	M.M. Dillon Ltd. (for Shenkman Corporation)	A	235	26
65	Minto Construction Limited	B	390	50
159	Minto Construction Limited	C	892	118
152	Novatech Engineering Consultants Ltd. (for Del Corporation)	C	878	114
69	Ottawa-Carleton Home Builders' Association	B	411	52
124	Ottawa-Carleton Home Builders' Association	C	745	97
156	Ottawa-Carleton Home Builders' Association	C	888	117
141	Ottawa Uplands Limited (per Gowling & Henderson)	C	840	110
113	Patterson, Gib (per Soloway, Wright, et. al.)	C	715	90
75	Perley-Robertson, Panet, et.al. (for Terrace Investments Ltd)	B	491	64
119	Perley-Robertson, Panet, et.al.	C	733	93
99	Proctor & Redfern Group (for M. Holitzner Limited)	C	646	84
85	Proctor & Redfern Group (for Taysham Investors Inc.)	B	536	69
31	Proctor & Redfern Group (for Taysham Investors Inc.)	A	133	24
27	Proctor and Redfern (for Jockvale Realty)	A	101	18
70	Richcraft Homes (per Cummings Cockburn Limited)	B	434	56
136	Scott & Aylen (for Gloucester Equestrian Centre Ltd.)	C	815	108
38	Shenkman Corporation (per M.M. Dillon Limited)	A	235	26
63	Soloway, Wright et.al. (for Campeau Corporation)	B	388	48
40	Soloway, Wright et.al. (for Ivanhoe Inc.)	A	260	29
41	Soloway, Wright et.al. (for Trilea Centres Inc.)	A	261	30
46	Soloway, Wright et.al. (for Campeau Corporation)	A	287	37
95	Soloway, Wright et.al. (for Campeau Corporation)	B	621	82
35	Soloway, Wright, et. al. (for Arnon Development Corporation)	A	224	25
36	Soloway, Wright, et. al. (for John Steenbakkers)	A	225	25
37	Soloway, Wright, et. al. (for Del Corporation)	A	235	26
30	Soloway, Wright, et. al. (for John Steenbakkers)	A	123	23
115	Soloway, Wright, et. al. (for Arnon Development Corporation)	C	720	90
112	Soloway, Wright, et. al. (for Famlit Investments et.al.)	C	714	90
114	Soloway, Wright, et. al. (for Cave Investments)	C	718	90
113	Soloway, Wright, et. al. (for Gib Patterson)	C	715	90
30	Steenbakkers, J. (per Soloway, Wright, et. al.)	A	123	23
36	Steenbakkers, J. (per Soloway, Wright, et. al.)	A	225	25
42	Tanglewood Ottawa Limited (per Kimmel, Victor & Ages)	A	263	31
88	Tanglewood Ottawa Limited	B	564	78
100	Tartan Development Corporation	C	648	85
20	Tartan Group Inc.	A	54	13
45	Tartan Group Inc.	A	285	37
31	Taysham Investors Incorporated (per Proctor & Redfern Group)	A	133	24
85	Taysham Investors Incorporated (per Proctor & Redfern Group)	B	536	69
75	Terrace Investments Ltd. (Perley-Robertson, Panet, et.al.)	B	491	64
119	Terrace Investments Ltd. (Perley-Robertson, Panet, et.al.)	C	733	93
41	Trilea Centres Incorporated (per Soloway, Wright et.al.)	A	261	30
55	W.J. Bell & Son Construction Ltd.	B	320	40

INDIVIDUALS
(see alphabetical listing)